DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 892	SO 014 454
TITLE	Study of State Arts Agencies: A Comprehensive Report.
INSTITUTION	National Research Center of the Arts, Inc., New York,. NY.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	447p.; For related documents, see SO 014 452-453. Some tables may not reproduce clearly due to small print type.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC18 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization; Administrators; Budgets; *Expenditures; Federal Government; Financial Needs; *Financial Support; *Fine Arts; Governing Boards; Government Role; Legislation; Local Government; *Organizational Objectives; *State Agencies; State Government; Tables (Data); Theater Arts; Visual Arts

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive analysis of state arts agencies in the 50 states and in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa is presented. Data were collected from interviews with agency directors and agency reports as of fiscal year 1974. The report is organized into eight chapters. Chapter 1 examines budget and finances at state and federal levels, private funds, expenditures, and types and methods of budget presentations. Chapter 2 describes mandated purposes, functions, practices, and trends of the agencies. Chapter 3 focuses on program emphases, restrictions, mandates, criteria of funding decisions, matching funds, and associated foundations. Chapter 4 details the distribution of project funds in terms of primary and secondary recipients, distribution by art form in each state, types of activity assisted, initiation and location of projects, audiences, and matching funds. Chapter 5 discusses arts agencies' relationships with departments of education, other state agencies, and local government. Chapter 6 outlines management practices and organizational structure. Chapter 7 describes characteristics, number, salaries, organization, and adequacy of state paid staff. The final chapter analyzes past developments and the future financial outlook. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER OF THE ARTS, INC.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED225892

STUDY OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES

A COMPREHENSIVE REPORT

Conducted for

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

By

NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER OF THE ARTS, INC.
an Affiliate of Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.

1976

SO 014 154

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION i

CHAPTER I: BUDGET AND FINANCES 1

Funds Received in Fiscal 1974 3
Sources of Funds Received by State Arts Agencies 5
A Closer Look at State Funds 10
A Closer Look at Federal Funds 13
A Closer Look at Private Funds 16
Funds Received by Separate Associated Foundations 19
Expenditures 21
Budget Submissions 27
Type of Budget Submitted 28
Methods of Submission of Budget 32

CHAPTER II: PURPOSES, FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES 36

Mandated Purposes 37
Functions and Practices 47
Trends and Shifts in Functions and Practices 55

CHAPTER III: PROGRAMS 58

Program Emphases 60
Restrictions and Mandates 65
Criteria for Funding or Denial of Funding 83
Specific Criteria Used in Funding Decisions 85
Matching Funds 90
Non-Funding Programs 92
Programs of Associated Foundations 97

CHAPTER IV: PROJECT EXPENDITURES 102

Total Expenditures 105
Highlights of the Distribution of the Project Expenditures 107
Sources of Funds for Project Expenditures 108
Primary, or Direct, Recipients of Project Expenditures 114
Primary Recipients by State 116
Sources of Funds for Expenditures to Primary, or Direct, Recipients 127
Secondary, or Indirect, Recipients 129
Distribution of Project Expenditures by Art Form 134
Distribution by Art Form by State 136
Distribution by Art Form of the Recipients 147
Sources of Funds for Expenditures in Art Form 150
Types of Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures 153
Types of Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures, by State 155

(Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER IV: PROJECT EXPENDITURES (Continued)

Primary Activity by Art Form.......................... 164
Primary Activity by Primary Recipient................. 166
Primary Acitvity by Source of Funds................... 169
Secondary Activities.................................. 171
Initiation of Projects................................ 173
Location of Projects.................................. 179
Previous Funding of Projects.......................... 181
Audiences and Attendance.............................. 186
Matching Funds.. 188
Cost of Projects...................................... 192

CHAPTER V: INTRASTATE AND INTERSTATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS....... 197

Departments or Commissions of Education............... 199
Types of Arts Activities of Education Departments.... 200
Evaluation of Relationship With Education Departments.. 206
Activities of Other State Agencies and Departments... 208
Services from Other State Agencies.................... 214
Interstate Relationships with Community Councils and Citizens' Groups............................. 216
Interstate Relationships and Regional Programming.... 220
Evaluation of Relationships........................... 230

CHAPTER VI: MANAGEMENT................................ 232

Position within the State Government Structure....... 234
Councils and Commissions.............................. 235
Composition of Councils/Commissions................... 237
Occupations of Council/Commission Members............ 239
Boards of Separate Associated Foundations............ 243
Selection of Council/Commission Members.............. 246
Terms of Service of Council/Commission Members....... 254
Meetings of the Council/Commission and Its Committees.. 257
Meetings of Council/Commission and Its Committees in Public Sessions................................ 262
Compensation to Members for Attendance at Meetings... 264
Chairman of the Council/Commission.................... 266
Directors of State Arts Agencies...................... 271
Activities of Directors............................... 276
Management Authority and Decision-Making Powers...... 288
Decision-Making Powers................................ 291

(Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER VII: MANPOWER.................................. 306

Number of Paid Staff.................................. 308
Type of Personnel..................................... 310
Characteristics of Paid Staff......................... 312
Salaries of Paid Staff................................ 313
Staffs of Associated Foundations...................... 315
Organization of Staff of State Arts Agencies......... 317
Adequacy of Staff..................................... 318
Civil Service/Merit Systems........................... 320
Salary Support from the National Endowment for the Arts.. 325
Outside Advisors or Consultants....................... 327
Selection of Panel Members............................ 330

CHAPTER VIII: PAST DEVELOPMENTS AND FUTURE OUTLOOK..... 337

State Appropriations.................................. 339
Change in State Appropriations Per Capita............ 343
Total Funds Received.................................. 346
Total Funds Received Per Capita....................... 349
Adequacy of Funding on Functions and Practices....... 352
Future Plans and Goals................................ 356
Effect of Possible Increases in Basic State Agency Grant.. 357

APPENDIX A: MODEL STATE ARTS COUNCIL ACT................ 365

APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY.................................... 368

INDEX OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER I BUDGET AND FINANCES

1. Total Funds of State Arts Agencies And Associated Separate Foundations in Fiscal 1974 4
2. Sources of Funds of State Arts Agencies in Fiscal 1974 6-8
3. Percentage of Funds From State Legislative Appropriations Fiscal 1974, By Total Expenditures 9
4. Sources of Other State Funds in Fiscal 1974 and Percentage of Total Funds Received 11
5. Percentage of State Appropriation in Fiscal 1974 For Administrative and for Program Purposes 12
6. Average Percentage of State Appropriation in Fiscal 1974 For Administration Purposes 13
7. Sources of Other Federal Funds in Fiscal 1974 and Percentage of Total Funds Received 15
8. Sources of Private Funds Received by State Arts Agencies in Fiscal 1974, and Percentage of Total Funds Received 17-18
9. Funds Received by Separate Foundations Associated with State Arts Agencies in Fiscal 1974 20
10. Expenditures of State Arts Agencies in Fiscal 1974 22-25
11. Expenditures of Separate Foundations Associated with State Arts Agencies in Fiscal 1974 26
12. Type of State Appropriation 27
13. Fiscal Year Covering Fiscal 1974 28
14. Type of Budget Submitted to State Legislature Fiscal 1974 29
15. Type of Budget Submitted to State Legislature Fiscal 1974, by Total Expenditures 29
16. Whether Funds Budgeted for One Line Item Can Be Used for Other Purpose After State Appropriation Has Been Made 30
17. Separation of Program and Administrative Furds in Budget Submissions 31
18. Whether Budget is Submitted to Legislature Through Another Individual, Agency or Office 32
19. Individual, Agency or Office Through Which Budget is Submitted to State Legislature 33
20. Whether Director or Member of the Agency Appeared Before Legislature in Behalf of Fiscal 1974 Budget 34
21. Whether Trends or Shifts in the Manner of Budget Submissions are Foreseen as Coming in 3 to 5 Years 35
22. Trends or Shifts in the Manner of Budget Submission Foreseen as Coming in 3 to 5 Years 35

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER II PURPOSES, FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES

23. Functions and Practices of State Arts Agencies................. 49-50
24. Whether Agencies Have Previously Engaged in Functions and Practices Not Engaged in During Fiscal 1974, And/Or Would Like to in the Future.................................. 52-53
25. Whether Trends or Shifts in Functions and Practices of Agency Are Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years.......................... 55
26. Trends or Shifts in Functions and Practices Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years... 56
27. Reasons Why Trends and Shifts Foreseen in Functions and Practices Will Occur...................................... 57

CHAPTER III PROGRAMS

28. Major Program Emphases of State Arts Agency................... 61
29. Perceived Future Balance of Programs.......................... 62
30. Trends or Shifts in Program Emphases of the Agency Foreseen in the Coming 3 to 5 Years................................... 64
31. Reasons Why Trends or Shifts Foreseen in Program Emphases of the Agency Will Occur.................................... 65
32. Legal Prohibitions Against Receiving Operating Revenues........ 66
33. Other Fiscal Prohibitions Under Which Agency Operates.......... 67
34. Restrictions or Prohibitions Currently Affecting Program Activities.. 69
35. Whether Agency Use Any Means of Subgranting Funds to Individuals or Organizations it is Prohibited From, or Prefers Not To, Fund Directly.. 70
36. Maximum Amount That May Be Granted For Single Project.......... 71
37. Whether Trends or Shifts in the Mandating by Legislature to Conduct Specific Activities are Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years... 72
38. Trends or Shifts in the Mandating by Legislature to Conduct Specific Activities Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years.......... 73
39. Distribution of Fiscal 1974 Legislative Appropriation By Earmarked Vs. Discretionary Funds........................... 74-75
40. Distribution of Private Funds Received in Fiscal 1974 By Earmarked Vs. Discretionary................................ 77-78
41. Sources of Private Funds Received in Fiscal 1974, By Earmarked Vs. Discretionary.. 79
42. Distribution of Program Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, By Earmarked Vs. Discretionary................................ 80-82
43. Whether Agency Has Written Grant Provisions or Program Guidelines... 83
44. Existence of Written Grant Provisions or Program Guidelines By Total Expenditures.. 84
45. Items That Are Usually a Part of The Agency's Decision-Making Process for Funding Projects.............................. 85
46. Criteria Involved in Decisions on the Funding of Projects...... 87
47. Other Criteria Important in Deciding Whether A Project Should Be Funded... 89

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER III PROGRAMS (Continued)

48. Other Reasons Important in Denying Formal Applications For The Funding of Projects in Fiscal 1974.................... 89
49. Requirements for Matching Funds.......................... 90
50. Percentage of Grant Required as Matching Funds............... 90
51. Types of Matching Funds Allowed by Agency.................... 91
52. Approximate Percentage of Formal Applications for Funding of Projects That Were Denied by the Agency in Fiscal 1974........ 91
53. Average Percentage of Applications Denied in Fiscal 1974 by Total Expenditures....................................... 92
54. Most Important Activities Undertaken by Agency in Addition to the Funding of Projects.................................. 93
55. Art Forms in Which Non-Funding Activities are Conducted....... 94
56. Types of Groups for Which Non-Funding Activities are Normally Conducted.. 95
57. Percentage of Work Time by Director and Staff Devoted to Non-Funding Activities..................................... 96
58. Activities of Associated Separate Foundation................. 97
59. Whether Trends or Shifts in the Activities of the Associated Separate Foundation are Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years..... 98
60. Trends or Shifts in the Activities of the Associated Separate Foundation Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years................. 98
61. Benefits of Having an Associated Separate Foundation.......... 99
62. Problems Involved in Having Associated Separate Foundation.... 100
63. Sources of Funds Received by Associated Separate Foundations in Fiscal 1974, by Earmarked Vs. Discretionary............. 101
64. Distribution of Funds Received by Associated Separate Foundations in Fiscal 1974 by Earmarked Vs. Discretionary........ 101

CHAPTER IV PROJECT EXPENDITURES

65. Project Expenditures and Number of Projects in Fiscal 1974.... 106
66. Sources of Funds for Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974...... 111-113
67. Primary, Or Direct, Recipients of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by State.................................. 119-124
68. Primary, Or Direct, Recipients of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by All States Except New York................. 126
69. Primary, Or Direct, Recipients of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Source of Funds.......................... 128
70. Secondary, Or Indirect, Recipients of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Primary Recipients...................... 132-133
71. Distribution by Art Form of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by State.. 138-143
72. Distribution by Art Form of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974 by Total Expenditures............................. 144
73. Distribution by Art Form of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Total Agencies and by Total Agencies Without New York.. 146
74. Distribution by Art Form of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Primary Recipients.............................. 148-149

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER IV PROJECT EXPENDITURES (Continued)

75. Distribution by Art Form of Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Source of Funds.......... 151-152
76. Primary Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by State.......... 157-162
77. Primary Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Total Expenditures.......... 163
78. Primary Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Art Form.......... 165
79. Primary Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Primary Recipients.......... 167-168
80. Primary Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974, by Source of Funds.......... 170
81. Secondary Activities Assisted by Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974.......... 172-173
82. Initiation of Projects For Which Expenditures Were Made in Fiscal 1974, by State.......... 175-177
83. Initiation of Projects For Which Expenditures Were Made in Fiscal 1974, by Total Expenditures.......... 178
84. Location of Projects For Which Expenditures Were Made in Fiscal 1974, by Total Expenditures.......... 180
85. Whether Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974 Were Continued Funding of Ongoing Projects, One-Time Funding or Pilot Projects.......... 182-184
86. Number of Years Ongoing Projects Had Been Funded.......... 185
87. Whether Continued Funding of Ongoing Projects is Anticipated.. 185
88. Matching Funds for Project Expenditures in Fiscal 1974........ 189-191
89. Total Costs of Projects For Which Expenditures Were Made in Fiscal 1974.......... 193-195

CHAPTER V INTRASTATE AND INTERSTATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

90. Levels of Education For Which Funds For The Arts are Provided by Education Departments.......... 200
91. Types of Arts Activities For Which Funds are Provided by State Education Departments.......... 201
92. Type of Relationship With Departments of Education.......... 202
93. Joint Programs Conducted With Education Departments.......... 203
94. Areas or Types of Activities in Which Support of Education Departments is Most Effective and Beneficial to the Arts.... 204
95. Areas or Types of Activities in Which Support of Education Departments is More Seriously Lacking.......... 205
96. Rating of Relationship With Education Departments.......... 206
97. Whether Trends or Shifts in Relationship With Departments of Education are Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years.......... 207
98. Trends or Shifts in Relationship With Departments of Education Foreseen During Coming 3 to 5 Years.......... 207
99. Agencies or Departments of the State Government Other Than The Education Department(s) That Provide Some Type of Support to the Arts.......... 209

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER V INTRASTATE AND INTERSTATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS (Continued)

100. Types of Support Provided by Agencies or Departments of the State Government Other than the Education Department(s)..... 210
101. Expectations Concerning Support of the Arts During the Coming 3 to 5 Years and Reasons For Such Expectations............ 211
102. Representation To and From Other Agencies.................... 213
103. Whether Required to Pay for Services Provided by Other State Agencies.. 214
104. Whether Rent is Paid and To Whom............................ 215
105. Evaluation of the Importance of Community Arts Councils to the Arts in the State...................................... 216
106. Support Relationship of State Arts Agencies to Community Arts Councils.. 217
107. Whether it is Thought that Relationship Between Agency and Community Councils Will Change in Coming 3 to 5 Years...... 218
108. Changes That are Thought Will Occur in Relationship Between State Arts Agency and Community Arts Councils............. 219
109. Whether Funds Were Ever Given to Agency in Another State to Act on Behalf of State Arts Agency........................ 221
110. Whether Funds Were Ever Given to Agency in Another State, by Region.. 221
111. Participation in Regional Organizations and Regional Programming... 222
112. Regional Organizations in Which State Arts Agencies Have Participated... 223
113. Contributions to Regional Organizations...................... 224
114. Regional Organizations or Projects in Which Participation is Planned... 225
115. Whether Regional Programming Will Increase During Coming 3 to 5 Years, and Why................................... 226
116. Reasons Regional Programming is a Benefit to the State....... 227
117. Reasons Regional Programming Does Not Benefit State.......... 228
118. Preferred Developments in Regional Programming.............. 229
119. Ratings of Relationships With Selected Groups, Agencies or Individuals... 231

CHAPTER VI MANAGEMENT

120. Position of State Arts Agency Within the State Government.... 234
121. Size of Council/Commission................................... 236
122. Average Membership of Council/Commission by Total Expenditures.. 237
123 Characteristics of Members of Council/Commission............. 238
124. Occupations of Council/Commission Members.................. 240-242
125. Size of Board of Separate Associated Foundation............. 243
126. Characteristics and Occupations of Members of Boards of Separate Associated Foundations.......................... 245
127. People With a Great Deal of Influence on Selection of New Members of Council/Commission.......................... 246

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER VI MANAGEMENT (Continued)

128. Two or Three Most Predominant Reasons in the Selection of Council/Commission Members Serving at the End of Fiscal 1974 248
129. Two or Three Reasons That Directors Feel Should be Most Predominant in Selection of Members of Council/Commission .. 249
130. Two or Three Most Predominant Reasons in Selection of Council/Commission Members Serving at End of Fiscal 1974 ... 252
131. Trends or Shifts in Reasons for Selection of Council/Commission Members Foreseen During Coming 3 to 5 Years 253
132. Terms of Service of Council/Commission Members 254
133. Number of Terms Eligible to Serve and Number of Terms Most Council/Commission Members Do Serve 255
134. Time Served on Council/Commission 256
135. Changes Desired in Terms of Service of Council/Commission Members 257
136. Number of Times Council/Commission is Mandated to Meet 258
137. Number of Times Council/Commission Met During Fiscal 1974 258
138. Number of Times Council/Commission Met During Fiscal 1974, by Total Expenditures 259
139. Average Percentage of Members Attending Council/Commission Meetings in Fiscal 1974 259
140. Whether Council/Commission Met in Committee Sessions During Fiscal 1974 260
141. Names of Committees of the Council/Commission 261
142. Functions of Committees of Council/Commission 261
143. Usefulness of Committees of Council/Commission 262
144. Whether Councils/Commissions Are Required to Meet in Public Session 262
145. Whether Committees Required to Meet in Public Sessions 264
146. Whether Council/Commission Members Are Compensated for Attending Meetings 265
147. Whether No Compensation is Made to Council/Commission Members For Attending Meetings, by Total Expenditures 266
148. Most Likely Persons to Suggest a Person for Chairman or to Initiate the Selection Process 267
149. Persons Who Name or Appoint Chairman 267
150. Power of Final Review or Approval of Selection of Chairman by Council/Commission 267
151. Term Which Chairman Serves 268
152. Whether Chairman Can Serve More than One Term 268
153. Whether Chairman Personally Meets, As a Function of His or Her Chairmanship, With the Governor on Matters Pertaining to the Agency, And Approximate Number of Times Such Meetings Were Held in Fiscal 1974 269
154. Whether Chairman Personally Meets With Administrative Assistant or Other Staff of Governor's Office on Matters Pertaining to the Agency, and Approximate Number of Times Such Meetings Were Held in Fiscal 1974 270

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER VI MANAGEMENT (Continued)

155. Whether Chairman Personally Meets With Individual Members of the State Legislature on Matters Pertaining to the Agency, and Approximate Number of Times Such Meetings Were Held in Fiscal 1974 270
156. Persons Who Select or Appoint Director 271
157. Characteristics of Directors 272
158. Arts and Non-Arts Management Experience 273
159. Years of Experience in Work in State Arts Agencies 274
160. Years in Current Position as Director 274
161. Salary of Director 275
162. Median Salary of Directors, by Total Expenditures of Agency .. 276
163. What Directors Feel Should be Major Functions of Their Job ... 277
164. Activities on Which Directors Spend a Great Deal of Time 278
165. Expectations of Changes in Amount of Time Spent by Director on Different Types of Activities in Coming 3 to 5 Years 280
166. Whether Director Personally Meets With Governor on Matters Pertaining to the Agency, and Approximate Number of Times Such Meetings Were Held in Fiscal 1974 281
167. Whether Director Personally Meets With Administrative Assistant or Other Staff of Governor's Office, and Approximate Number of Times Such Meetings Were Held in Fiscal 1974 281
168. Whether Director Personally Meets With Individual Members of the State Legislature, and Approximate Number of Times Such Meetings Were Held in Fiscal 1974 282
169. Meetings of Chairman and Directors With State Hierarchy 283
170. Other Channels of Communication With Governor, Governor's Staff and Individual Members of Legislature 284
171. Whether Trends or Shifts in Communication of Director With Governor and Staff and Individual Members of State Legislature Are Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years 284
172. Trends or Shifts in Communication of Director With Governor and Staff and Individual Members of State Legislature Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years 285
173. Other Government Officials Directors Feel Are Most Critical to the State Arts Agency 286
174. Whether Trends or Shifts in Which Government Official(s) Will Be Most Critical in Determining Level of Appropriations or Frequency of Contact by Director With Such Officials Are Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years 287
175. Trends or Shifts in Government Official(s)' Determination of Level of Appropriations or Director's Contact With Them Foreseen in Coming 3 to 5 Years 287
176. Discretionary Grant-Making Powers in Fiscal 1974 288
177. Discretionary Grant-Making Powers in Fiscal 1974, by Total Expenditures 289
178. Discretionary Grant-Making Power Within Broad Program Areas Approved by Council/Commission in Fiscal 1974 290
179. Maximum Amount For Which Director or Other Staff Had Discretionary Power Within Broad Program Areas Approved By Council/Commission 290

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER VI MANAGEMENT (Continued)

180. Whether Chairman Has Power to Appoint Committees of the Council/Commission........ 291
181. Responsibility for Overall Policy and Long-Range Planning.... 293
182. Responsibility for Budget........ 295
183. Responsibility for Formulation of Guidelines and Program Planning........ 297
184. Responsibility for Grants or Project Funding........ 299
185. Responsibility for Follow-Up Evaluation........ 301
186. Responsibility for Administrative Matters........ 303
187. Outside Officials With Veto Power Over Decisions Made by State Arts Agency........ 304

CHAPTER VII MANPOWER

188. Number of Paid Staff, Including Director and Consultants and Contract Personnel, Serving in a Staff Capacity at Close of Fiscal 1974........ 309
189. Average Number of Paid Staff at Close of Fiscal 1974, by Total Expenditures........ 310
190. Type of Personnel........ 311
191. Type of Personnel, by Executive-Professional Vs. Clerical Staff........ 312
192. Characteristics of Paid Staff........ 313
193. Salaries of Paid Staff........ 314
194. Median Salary of Men and Women........ 315
195. Number of Paid Staff of Separate Associated Foundations at Close of Fiscal 1974........ 316
196. Type of Personnel and Characteristics of Paid Staff of Separate Associated Foundations........ 317
197. Organization of Professional Staff Apart from Director,...... 318
198. Adequacy of Number of Staff in Terms of Agency's Current Activities and Responsibilities........ 319
199. Adequacy of Experience or Training of Staff of Agency........ 320
200. Whether Staff Members Other Than Director Are Under State Civil Service or Merit System........ 321
201. Whether Civil Service/Merit System Positions Must be Filled in Order Determined by the System........ 322
202. Whether Salaries of Staff Other Than Directors are Set by the State........ 322
203. Persons With Authority to Set Non-State Regulated Salaries,... 323
204. Comparison of Salary Levels in State Arts Agencies with Those of Other Agencies in the State........ 323
205. Adequacy of Current Salary Levels to Attract or Keep Needed Personnel........ 324
206. Staff Members And/Or Consultants or Contract Personnel Performing Staff-Like Functions Paid in Whole or in Part by Funds from the National Endowment For The Arts, Fiscal 1974 325

INDEX OF TABLES
(Continued)

Page

CHAPTER VII MANPOWER (Continued)

207. Staff Members And/Or Consultants or Contract Personnel Performing Staff-Like Functions Paid in Whole or in Part by Funds from the National Endowment for the Arts, Fiscal 1975 326
208. Use of Panels of Experts by Agency 327
209. Use of Panels in Fiscal 1974, by Region 328
210. Names of Panels Agencies Had in Fiscal 1974 329
211. Selection of Members of Panels 331
212. Whether Panel Members Are Compensated 332
213. Whether Trends or Shifts in the Use of Panels Are Foreseen in the Coming 3 to 5 Years 332
214. Use of Other Outside Advisors or Consultants in Fiscal 1974 333
215. Selection of Outside Advisors or Consultants 334
216. Compensation of Outside Advisors or Consultants 335
217. Use of Volunteers Other Than Council/Commission Members 335

CHAPTER VIII PAST DEVELOPMENTS AND FUTURE OUTLOOK

218. State Legislative Appropriations, Fiscal 1966-1976 342
219. State Appropriations Per Capita, With Rankings, Fiscal 1970-1975 344-345
220. Total Funds Received, Fiscal 1971-1976 347-348
221. Total Funds Received Per Capita, With Rankings, Fiscal 1971-1975 350-351
222. Adequacy of Total Funding Level From All Sources for the Agency's Functions and Practices 352
223. Adequacy of Total Funding Level in Fiscal 1974 by Total Expenditures 353
224. Whether Trends or Shifts in the Level of Funding Expected are Foreseen During Coming 3 to 5 Years 354
225. Trends or Shifts in the Level of Funding Expected Foreseen During Coming 3 to 5 Years 354
226. Reasons Why Trends or Shifts in Level of Funding are Foreseen 355
227. Existence of Long-Term Plans and Goals 356
228. Existence of Long-Term Plans and Goals, by Total Expenditures 357
229. Directions of Programming With Possible Increases in Basic State Agency Grant 358
230. New Areas of Programming Agency Would Engage in if Basic State Agency Grant were Increased to the $250,000 Level 359
231. New Areas of Programming Agency Would Engage in if Basic State Agency Grant Were Increased to the $750,000 Level 360
232. Two or Three Areas in Which Funds Would Be Spent in the Next Two to Three Years, If Sufficient Funds Were Available For Improvements or Changes in Programming, Staffing or Other Activities 362
233. Two or Three Areas in Which Funds Would Be Spent in the Next Five to Ten Years, If Sufficient Funds Were Available For Improvements or Changes in Programming, Staffing or Other Activities 363

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade the state arts agency movement has grown and flowered in this country to become a major force for the arts and culture. With the exception of the Utah Arts Institute, founded in 1899, the state arts agency movement can be said to have begun with the creation of the New York State Council on the Arts in 1960. This was soon followed by other state agencies set up by executive orders or legislative acts, with most agencies being founded during the mid-1960's. Today there is an official agency for the arts in each of the 50 states as well as in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam and American Samoa.

In 1966 the Associated Councils of the Arts (ACA) began an annual compilation and publication of data on the funds administered by the state arts agencies. In 1972 the National Research Center of the Arts, on behalf of Associated Councils of the Arts, collected more extensive data on the fiscal 1971 and fiscal 1972 funds of the agencies, published by ACA under the title State Arts Councils. However, these data were limited to funds received and expended and the number of projects in various categories, and within these areas only the most basic information was obtained.

It was evident to many people in the state arts agency field, and to those interested in support of state arts agencies, that the programs and policies of the agencies were being severely hampered by the lack of comprehensive information. In 1974 directors of state arts agencies endorsed the undertaking of a study of the agencies by the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Endowment contracted with the National Research Center of the Arts to conduct this study.

During 1974 three series of meetings were held with state arts agency directors and chairmen, National Endowment for the Arts representatives and staff of the National Research Center of the Arts, the first to block out the substantive areas to be covered in the study, the second to review a questionnaire developed by the Research Center, and the third to approve a final questionnaire. The collection of data was planned to begin in late 1974, and the questionnaire focused on fiscal 1974. However, necessary clearances by the Office of Management and Budget were unexpectedly delayed, and the actual collection of data did not begin until mid-1975.

Coverage of the Study

Using questionnaires and forms developed with the assistance of consultant state arts agency directors and chairmen, the study collected data on a wide spectrum of agency activities and programs, including the basic organization and structure of the agency, its relationship to other agencies within the state and with other states and the federal government, the council or commission governing the agency and the chairman of that council/commission, the director and staff of the agency, the agency's functions, practices and programs, expenditures (grants, contracts, etc.) made for projects, and so on.

The broad scope of the study was intended to provide a compendium of data that would serve as a base point for continuing research on particular aspects of the agency movement. Similarly, the Research Center was charged with the responsibility for collecting and interpreting the data so as to provide an in-depth picture of the state arts agencies as of the time of the survey. This report attempts to do that; it is not in any way an evaluation of the agencies nor an analysis of causal factors.

It should be noted that, although the survey covered an extensive range of subjects related to state arts agencies, there are areas of importance that it was impossible to include in this research. Perhaps the most important of these is an inventory of a state's cultural resources; this information, which is vital for a complete understanding of the arts and culture on a statewide basis, can be obtained only through a survey of the arts organizations and cultural institutions themselves. It should also be pointed out that information on arts and cultural activities of other state agencies included in this report was supplied by the directors of the state arts agencies, and not by those other state agencies, so that data on their activities may be incomplete; furthermore, it was impossible to put any dollar values on other agencies' activities in support of the arts without direct contact with the agencies.

Collection of the Data

The data were collected through a questionnaire administered in in-person interviews conducted by representatives of the National Research Center of the Arts with the directors of the state arts agencies. The directors were notified of the study and the areas of coverage through a memorandum from the Chairman of the Endowment, Nancy Hanks, which also explained that they would be contacted directly by interviewers from the Research Center. The interviewers subsequently telephoned the directors and set up appointments for the personal interviews. These interviews were usually conducted in two sessions of approximately three hours' length each. (The questionnaires for Guam and American Samoa were completed in writing and returned by mail.) The questionnaires were divided into four sections: Section I, Structure and Organization and Relationships with Other Groups and Organizations; Section II, Council/Commission and Staff; Section III, Functions and Practices; and Section IV, Programs.

It should be stressed that in all cases the interviews were conducted with the director of the agency; in some cases the position was held by an interim or acting director who was interviewed. (The American Samoa questionnaire was completed by the chairman, since the position of director did not exist.) Thus information on council/commission chairmen and members is based on the directors' knowledge and was not obtained from the chairmen and members.

In addition to the in-person interviews, three self-administered forms were left with the agencies for completion by them. One of these self-administered forms covered the race, age, length of service and occupation of members of councils/commissions and of boards of associated foundations, if any, and the number, type and characteristics of paid staff, including their salaries, and of staffs of associated foundations, if any. Another form detailed the amount and sources of funds received during fiscal 1974, and the funds expended by the agency during that year, as well as total state appropriations and total amounts received during fiscal 1972, fiscal 1973, fiscal 1975 and fiscal 1976; information on amount and sources of funds received and amount expended in fiscal 1974 by the associated foundation, if any, was also obtained on this form.

The third form was completed by agencies for each project expenditure made in fiscal 1974, and indicated the amount and sources of funds for the expenditures, the primary and secondary recipients, the initiator of the project, the previous and anticipated funding of the project, the primary and secondary type of activity assisted, the art form, the locations of the project, the audiences and attendance, and artists and organizations involved, and the matching funds and total costs of the project.

All agencies had to complete multiple numbers of these forms, and for some agencies the numbers ran into the hundreds. Almost all agencies were able, however, to provide all data necessary on their project expenditures; in a few cases, National Research Center personnel were required to assist the agencies in the completion of the project expenditure forms. In the case of the Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts, the forms remain somewhat incomplete even after all efforts were exhausted, but the figures for that state art agency used in the report are believed to be reasonably accurate.

Agency Groupings

In the tabulation of findings, the data were assembled not only in total but also by groups of agencies. These groups were chosen to see if an agency's geographic location, the total and per capita amounts of expenditures, the population size/density of the state, the proportion of the state's population living in metropolitan areas, and the percentage of the state arts agency's funds derived from state appropriations had significant effects on agency programs and policies.

Generally, the data did not indicate that these groupings revealed significant differences in agency programs and policies. In some cases, however, the regional expenditures and total expenditure groupings did reveal interesting differences or similarities among agencies, and where this occurred, the tables include these groupings. The states in each group are shown in the following:

Regions (Not including Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam and American Samoa)

Northeast
Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania

South
Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas

North Central
Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas

West
Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska and Hawaii

Expenditures (Fiscal 1974)

Below $250,000
Guam, American Samoa, North Dakota, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Wisconsin, Montana, New Hampshire, Nebraska, Vermont, Delaware, New Mexico, District of Columbia and Louisiana

$250,000-499,999
Total
Less than $.17 per capita
Kansas, Oregon, Iowa, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Arizona, Colorado, Alabama, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Georgia, Washington and Indiana
$.17 and above
Utah, South Dakota, Virgin Islands, Maine, Rhode Island and Arkansas

$500,000-749,999
Total
Less than $.17 per capita
Florida, Tennessee, Massachusetts and Texas
$.17 and above
Alaska, West Virginia, Connecticut, Minnesota, South Carolina and Maryland

$750,000 and above
Total
Less than $.17 per capita
Illinois, New Jersey, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio and California
$.17 and above
Hawaii, Missouri, Puerto Rico and New York

Limitations of the Data

In considering the findings contained in this report, the reader should keep in mind certain limitations of the study. First, as already noted, is the fact that the information was obtained from state arts agency directors, and therefore is based on the directors' knowledge and perceptions. Thus much of the data, particularly those sections referring to other persons and other agencies, must be considered as subjective on the part of the director rather than as objective factual material.

It should also be pointed out that the survey employed a large number of open-end questions. In recording the answers to these questions, in which the directors were not offered structured responses but were allowed to volunteer any answers, interviewers provide the verbatim responses of the directors, which were then coded by National Research Center technicians for computer tabulations. In a basic study such as this, these open-end questions are especially necessary, since the range of possible answers is unknown. However, they should be interpreted as offering the information that came to the directors' minds when asked the question, and because a director did not cite an item in response to such a question does not mean necessarily that that item does not pertain to that agency. For example, in response to an open-end question on what restrictions or prohibitions affect program activities, three directors volunteered that they could make grants only to non-profit or tax-exempt organizations, but this does not mean that other agencies could make such grants. It only indicates that such a restriction did not occur to them in the context of the question.

It should always be remembered that unless specifically stated otherwise, all data refer to the fiscal year 1974, i.e., the fiscal year ending in 1974.

Acknowledgements

This study could never have been completed without the aid and cooperation of the directors and staff of the 55 arts agencies that were surveyed, and the National Research Center is grateful for the time and effort that were put into the careful completion of the interviews and self-administered forms.

Of particular help and guidance were the consultant directors and chairmen (representing in number nearly half the states) who participated in the meetings to develop the survey instruments and in two meetings held in November 1975 and March 1976 to consider the significance of the findings and to review the initial draft of this report. The participants in the five meetings were:

James Backas, then Executive Director, Maryland Arts Council

Robert Bernat, then Executive Director, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Council on the Arts

Polly Buck, then Chairman, Delaware State Arts Council

Charlotte Carver, Executive Director, South Dakota State Fine Arts Council

Maurice D. Coats, Executive Director, Texas Commission on the Arts and Humanities

John G. Coe, Executive Director, New Hampshire Commission on the Arts

Nash Cox, Executive Director, Kentucky Arts Commission

James Edgy, Executive Director, Ohio Arts Council

James D. Forward, then Executive Director, California Arts Commission

Terrell Glenn, then Chairman, South Carolina Arts Commission

Roy H. Helms, Executive Director, Alaska State Council on the Arts

Jonathan Katz, Executive Director, Kansas Cultural Arts Commission

Anthony S. Keller, Executive Director, Connecticut Commission on the Arts

David Morton, then Chairman, Missouri State Council on the Arts

Wayne A. Norman, Sr., Chairman, Iowa State Arts Council

S. Leonard Pas, Jr., then Executive Director, Fine Arts Council of Florida

Lida Rogers, Executive Director, Mississippi Arts Commission

R. Sandra Perry, Executive Director, The Office of Arkansas State Arts and Humanities

E. Ray Scott, Executive Director, Michigan Council for the Arts

Louise G. Tate, Executive Director, Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities

Anne Vermel, Executive Director, Rhode Island State Council on the Arts

Norman Worrell, Executive Director, Tennessee Arts Commission

The staff of the National Endowment for the Arts played an essential role in the study in every phase, notably the leadership and encouragement provided by Nancy Hanks, the Chairman, and the advice and counsel given by Harold Horowitz, Director of Research, Ana Steele, Director of Planning, David Waterman, assistant to Mr. Horowitz, and other members of the Research Staff, Clark Mitze, then Director of the Office of the Federal-State Partnership, Donald Dillon, Assistant Director, and other members of that office.

Finally, a special word of thanks is due Bernard Lacy and Michael Edison of the Research Center staff for their outstanding analytical and managerial skills brought to bear in this research.

Joseph Farrell
President
National Research Center
of the Arts

May 31, 1976

CHAPTER I

BUDGET AND FINANCES

BUDGET AND FINANCES

This chapter considers the budget and finances of the state arts agencies for fiscal 1974, i.e., the fiscal year that ended in 1974. The financial picture is viewed first from the amount of funds received during the fiscal year and then the total expenditures made during the year by the state arts agencies. The funds received are analyzed in total and by the sources of the funds, including:

--State funds, with a closer look at the distribution of funds from legislative appropriations and from other state sources.

--Municipal/county funds

--Private funds, with a closer look at the distribution of funds from foundations, individuals, corporations, earnings, and other private sources.

--Federal funds, including funds from the National Endowment for the Arts -- both from the basic state agency grant and other Endowment sources -- and from other federal sources, with an alalysis of the latter by the federal agencies from which they were received.

The funds received by separate foundations associated with the state arts agencies are also detailed by their sources, including the state arts agency itself, other state sources, the National Endowment for the Arts, and private and other sources.

The expenditures of the state arts agencies are shown in total, as well as by amounts expended for programs, including expenditures for administration and development of programs, for other personnel costs, and for other administration expenditures.

The final section of the chapter concerns budget practices of the agencies, focusing on the types of appropriations (annual or bienial) received, the fiscal year covered, the type of budget submitted, and the means of submission, with directors' views of changes that may be expected in budget submissions.

Funds received in fiscal 1974

The total appropriations, grants and other funds from all sources to the 55 state arts agencies of the United States -- in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands amounted to $45,536,517 in fiscal 1974. Of that total, $44,155,072 was received by the agencies and an additional $1,381,445 by separate foundations* associated with twelve of the agencies from sources other than the agencies.

The funds of the New York State arts agency -- the New York State Council on the Arts -- and its associated foundation were by far the largest of any single agency, totaling $16,895,243. However, seven other agencies did receive more than $1,000,000, and even excluding New York State the average amount of funds per state was above $500,000.

The per capita amount of total funds varies widely, with the highest per capita funds in the states with very small populations -- e.g. American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and Alaska -- where the funds received from the National Endowment for the Arts in the basic state agency grants alone would result in high per capita amounts.

---

*Associated sparate foundations are foundations set up by the state art agency to supplement its own activities and/or to serve as a private fund-raising arm of the agency.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table I
TOTAL FUNDS OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES AND ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATIONS IN FISCAL 1974

	Total $	Per Capita $
New York	16,895,243*	.933
Puerto Rico	3,012,167	.992
California	1,267,747	.061
Connecticut	1,156,192*	.374
Ohio	1,084,075	.101
Pennsylvania	1,063,927	.090
Illinois	1,033,868*	.093
Michigan	1,027,048*	.113
New Jersey	901,482	.123
Massachusetts	877,600*	.151
Missouri	839,837	.176
Hawaii	777,727	.918
South Carolina	761,921*	.274
Texas	747,140	.062
Maryland	722,352	.176
Minnesota	704,585	.180
Indiana	550,747*	.103
Tennessee	544,752	.132
West Virginia	542,280	.303
Florida	512,183*	.063
Alaska	500,774	1.486
Arkansas	481,085	.233
Washington	470,164	.135
North Carolina	445,048	.083
Georgia	443,617	.091
Kentucky	428,338	.128
Rhode Island	418,412	.447
Colorado	413,968*	.166
Virginia	412,317	.084
Maine	385,569	.368
Alabama	356,085	.100
Virgin Islands	343,167	3.813
Oklahoma	315,925	.117
Arizona	305,485	.142
Mississippi	301,298	.130
Iowa	291,787	.102
Oregon	290,275*	.128
Louisiana	286,150	.076
Utah	271,726	.232
South Dakota	265,032	.389
Kansas	261,059	.115
Delaware	246,885	.431
Vermont	245,031	.521
New Hampshire	244,412	.302
New Mexico	244,295	.218
Nebraska	243,941*	.158
Montana	227,092	.309
Wisconsin	220,472	.048
Wyoming	202,580*	.564
District of Columbia	202,000	.279
Nevada	188,970	.330
Idaho	183,508	.230
North Dakota	179,100	.282
American Samoa	120,000	4.139
Guam	78,077	.743
TOTAL	45,536,517	.212
Total without New York	28,641,274	.146

Average per state:	827,937
Average without New York:	530,393

---

* Includes funds received by associated foundation.

Sources of Funds Received by State Arts Agencies

Of the total $44,155,072 received in fiscal 1974 by the agencies (not including funds received by associated foundations), 71% or $31,273,166 was received from the state governments, 27% or $12,008,050 from the federal government, less than 0.5% from local municipal or county sources, including school districts, and 2% from private and other sources.

The far above average legislative appropriation made to the New York State Council on the Arts is a major factor in the high proportion of funds derived from state governments but, even excluding New York State, states were still the source for a majority of the funds received during the year. Fifty-four percent of the total of $27,554,072 received by the 54 agencies other than New York in fiscal 1974 -- or $14,828,166 -- represented state funds, with 43% or $11,852,050 from the federal government, less than 0.5% from local governments and 3% from private and other sources.

However, sharp variations can be seen in the proportion of funds by source received by individual agencies, with federal government funds ranging from only 1% of New York State's total funds, 7% of funds received by the Puerto Rico agency and 18% in California, to 93% of total funds in Wyoming, 94% in Idaho and 97% in North Dakota. In fact, 33 of the 55 state arts agencies received at least 50% of their funds from federal government sources.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
SOURCES OF FUNDS OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974

		State						National Endowment for the Arts		
	Total $/%	Total $/%	Legislative Appropriation $/%	Other $/%	Municipal/ County $/%	Private $/%	Total Federal $/%	Basic State Agency Grant $/%	Other Grants $/%	Other Federal $/%
Alabama	356,085 100	125,000 35	125,000 35	-	-	818 *	230,267 65	150,000 43	75,267 21	5,000 1
Alaska	500,774 100	149,600 30	149,600 30	-	2,851 1	70,153 14	278,170 55	150,000 30	122,170 24	6,000 1
American Samoa	120,000 100	60,000 50	60,000 50	-	-	-	60,000 50	60,000 50	-	-
Arizona	305,485 100	68,700 22	68,700 22	-	3,445 1	12,155 4	221,185 73	150,000 50	59,183 19	12,002 4
Arkansas	481,085 100	166,727 35	166,727 35	-	21,100 4	39,500 8	253,758 53	150,000 31	100,758 21	3,000 1
California	1,267,747 100	1,034,763 82	1,034,763 82	-	-	-	232,984 18	150,000 11	82,984 7	-
Colorado	319,975 100	120,963 38	120,963 38	-	11,579 4	-	187,433 58	150,000 46	37,433 12	-
Connecticut	625,917 100	351,500 56	351,500 56	-	-	1,500 *	272,917 44	150,000 24	122,917 20	-
Delaware	246,885 100	42,600 17	42,600 17	-	-	2,402 1	201,883 82	150,000 61	47,763 19	4,120 2
District of Columbia	202,000 100	52,000 26	52,000 26	-	-	-	150,000 74	150,000 74	-	-
Florida	504,945 100	289,895 57	289,895 57	-	-	-	215,050 43	150,000 30	60,050 12	5,000 1
Georgia	443,617 100	220,000 50	220,000 50	-	-	5,000 1	218,617 49	150,000 33	65,617 15	3,000 1
Guam	78,077 100	10,218 13	10,218 13	-	-	1,485 2	66,376 85	55,509 71	10,865 14	-
Hawaii	777,727 100	560,817 72	221,307 28	339,510 44	-	4,389 1	212,521 27	150,000 19	62,521 8	-
Idaho	183,508 100	10,000 5	10,000 5	-	-	2,175 1	171,333 94	150,000 82	16,333 9	5,000 3
Illinois	877,511 100	600,000 68	600,000 68	-	-	-	277,511 32	150,000 17	127,511 15	-
Indiana	500,922 100	170,005 34	170,005 34	-	-	137,356 27	193,561 39	150,000 30	43,561 9	-
Iowa	291,787 100	52,244 18	52,244 18	-	-	2,002 1	237,541 81	150,000 51	82,541 28	5,000 2
Kansas	261,059 100	45,634 17	45,634 17	-	-	-	215,425 83	150,000 58	65,425 25	-
Kentucky	428,338 100	201,638 47	153,930 36	47,708 11	-	-	226,700 53	150,000 35	71,700 17	5,000 1
Louisiana	286,150 100	44,000 15	44,000 15	-	-	-	242,150 85	150,000 53	92,150 32	-
Maine	385,569 100	184,046 48	162,000 42	22,046 6	-	806 *	200,717 52	150,000 39	50,717 13	-
Maryland	722,352 100	468,411 65	453,411 63	15,000 2	-	6,150 1	247,791 34	150,000 20	97,791 14	-

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
SOURCES OF FUNDS OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974
(Continued)

		State						National Endowment for the Arts		
	Total $/%	Total $/%	Legislative Appropriation $/%	Other $/%	Municipal/ County $/%	Private $/%	Total Federal $/%	Basic State Agency Grant $/%	Other Grants $/%	Other Federal $/%
Massachusetts	785,000	600,000	600,000	-	-	-	185,000	150,000	35,000	-
	100	76	76				24	20	4	
Michigan	941,079	488,501	485,800	2,701	-	147,275	305,303	150,000	155,303	-
	100	52	52	*		16	32	16	16	
Minnesota	704,585	325,000	300,000	25,000	-	34,161	345,424	150,000	195,424	-
	100	46	43	4		5	49	21	28	
Mississippi	301,298	107,668	107,668	-	1,850	-	191,780	150,000	38,780	3,000
	100	36	36		1		63	49	13	1
Missouri	839,837	654,920	654,920	-	-	-	184,917	150,000	31,917	3,000
	100	78	78				22	18	4	*
Montana	227,092	27,550	27,550	-	12,142	-	187,400	150,000	37,400	-
	100	12	12		5		83	67	16	
Nebraska	240,274	35,122	35,122	-	-	11,441	193,711	150,000	40,711	3,000
	100	15	15			5	80	62	17	1
Nevada	188,970	15,122	15,122	-	-	1,191	172,657	150,000	22,657	-
	100	8	8			1	91	79	12	
New Hampshire	244,412	45,679	45,679	-	-	-	198,733	150,000	48,733	-
	100	19	19				81	61	20	
New Jersey	901,482	698,932	698,932	-	-	-	202,550	150,000	42,550	10,000
	100	78	78				22	16	5	1
New Mexico	244,295	45,300	45,300	-	9,150	4,345	185,500	150,000	35,000	500
	100	19	19		4	2	75	61	14	*
New York	16,601,000	16,445,000	16,445,000	-	-	-	156,000	150,000	6,000	-
	100	99	99				1	1	*	
North Carolina	445,048	221,231	221,231	-	-	2,500	221,317	150,000	71,317	-
	100	50	50			1	49	33	16	
North Dakota	179,100	5,100	5,100	-	-	-	174,000	150,000	21,000	3,000
	100	3	3				97	83	12	2
Ohio	1,084,075	849,847	849,847	-	-	-	234,228	150,000	79,228	5,000
	100	78	78				22	15	7	*
Oklahoma	315,925	95,100	95,100	-	12,625	-	208,200	150,000	58,200	-
	100	30	30		4		66	48	18	
Oregon	271,713	54,563	54,563	-	-	-	217,150	150,000	62,150	5,000
	100	20	20				80	55	23	2
Pennsylvania	1,063,927	765,500	758,000	7,500	4,920	-	293,507	150,000	143,507	-
	100	72	71	1	*		28	14	14	
Puerto Rico	3,012,167	2,753,267	2,753,267	-	-	47,400	211,500	150,000	-	61,500
	100	91	91			2	7	5		2
Rhode Island	418,412	136,231	126,231	10,000	10,989	23,609	247,583	150,000	97,583	-
	100	32	30	2	3	6	59	36	23	
South Carolina	713,755	360,896	360,896	-	33,090	21,750	298,019	150,000	144,798	3,221
	100	51	51		5	3	41	21	20	*
South Dakota	265,032	67,773	61,702	6,071	-	476	196,783	150,000	46,783	-
	100	25	23	2		*	75	57	18	
Tennessee	544,752	353,636	312,500	41,136	-	3,416	187,700	150,000	37,700	-
	100	65	57	8		1	34	27	7	
Texas	747,140	157,345	157,345	-	-	138,723	451,072	150,000	142,296	158,776
	100	21	21			19	60	20	19	21

(Conti

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

SOURCES OF FUNDS OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974
(Continued)

		State						National Endowment for the Arts		
	Total $/%	Total $/%	Legislative Appropriation $/%	Other $/%	Municipal/County $/%	Private $/%	Total Federal $/%	Basic State Agency Grant $/%	Other Grants $/%	Other Federal $/%
Utah	271,726	104,026	104,026	-	-	500	167,200	150,000	17,200	-
	100	38	38			*	62	56	6	
Vermont	245,031	52,626	52,626	-	-	2,030	190,375	150,000	37,375	3,000
	100	21	21			1	78	62	15	1
Virgin Islands	343,167	160,000	160,000	-	-	15,500	167,667	150,000	17,667	-
	100	47	47			5	48	43	5	
Virginia	412,317	201,705	201,705	-	-	7,070	203,542	150,000	53,542	-
	100	49	49			2	49	36	13	
Washington	470,164	98,415	98,415	-	-	-	371,749	150,000	147,838	73,911
	100	21	21				79	32	31	16
West Virginia	542,280	263,580	263,580	-	-	-	278,700	150,000	123,700	5,000
	100	49	49				51	27	23	1
Wisconsin	220,472	42,227	42,227	-	-	-	178,245	150,000	28,245	-
	100	19	19				81	68	13	
Wyoming	202,030	12,543	12,543	-	-	2,837	186,650	150,000	36,650	-
	100	6	6			1	93	75	18	
Total Funds Received by State Arts Agencies	44,155,072	31,273,166	30,756,494	516,672	123,741	750,115	12,008,050	8,065,509	3,551,511	391,030
	100	71	70	1	*	2	27	18	8	1
Total Without New York	27,554,072	14,828,166	14,311,494	516,672	123,741	750,115	11,852,050	7,915,509	3,545,511	391,030
	100	54	52	2	*	3	43	29	13	1

1/Includes $27,000 received in Arkansas from colleges and universities, and $2,345 received in New Mexico from reimbursements and the Four Corners Regional Commission.

* Less than 0.5%

The percentage of total funds derived from state legislative appropriations was sharply higher among those agencies with higher total expenditures, rising from 16% of agencies in the lower expenditure group to 90% in the highest.

Table 3

PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS FROM STATE LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

	Total Funds Received	State Legislative Appropriations
	$ / %	$ / %
Total Agencies	44,155,072 100	30,756,494 71
Expenditures Below $250,000	3,108,296 100	500,087 16
$250,000-$499,999	7,288,724 100	2,515,844 35
$5,000,000-$749,999	6,391,500 100	3,238,727 51
$750,000 and above	27,366,552 100	24,501,836 90

A Closer Look at State Funds

Appropriations from state legislatures accounted for almost all of state funds to the arts agencies in fiscal 1974. Of the total $31,273,166 from state sources ($14,828,166 excluding New York), and a minimal $516,672 or 1% of total funds received (2% excluding New York) was derived from sources other than legislative appropriations. In fact only ten states received any state funds in addition to the legislative appropriations.

However, state funds from sources other than the legislative appropriation did account for a significant amount of total funds in a few agencies. In Hawaii, in fact, state funds other than the legislative appropriation represented 44% of the total funds received by the Hawaii State Foundation on Culture and the Arts, a larger amount than that from any other source. The major reason for this was Hawaiian legislation setting aside 1% of the appropriations for original construction of any state building to be used for the acquisition of works of art* The State Foundation on Culture and the Arts received $327,787 (43% of total funds) for this purpose in fiscal 1974, plus $8,223 from the state university and $3,500 from the state's Bicentennial commission. With an additional state appropriation of $221,307 (28% of total funds), state sources accounted for 72% of total funds received by Hawaii in fiscal 1974.

Eleven percent of total funds ($47,708) received by the Kentucky Arts Commission was derived from the governor's contingency funds, and in Tennessee 8% of total funds came from other state sources: 4% ($19,469) from the department of conservation, 2% ($11,117) from the department of personnel, and 2% ($10,550) from the economic department. In Maine, 6% of total funds was from other state sources: 3% ($12,046) from the department of education, and 3% ($10,000) from the executive council. In no other state, though, did other state sources account for as much as 5% of total funds received.

---

*The 1967 legislation places the responsibility for the commissioning of artists for: reviewing of design, execution and placement, and the acceptance of works of art for state buildings with the state comptroller and the Hawaii State Foundation on Culture and the Arts.

Table 4

SOURCES OF OTHER STATE FUNDS IN FISCAL 1974 AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED

	Total	Governor's Grant/ Contingency Fund	Dept. of Education	Economic Department/ Economics and Community Development	Dept. of Personnel	Dept. of Conservation	State Bicentennial Commission	Executive Council	Art in State Buildings Legislation	State University	General Fund
	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%
Hawaii	339,510 44	-	-	-	-	-	3,500 *	-	327,787 43	8,223 1	-
Kentucky	47,708 11	47,708 11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	22,046 6	-	12,046 3	-	-	-	-	10,000 3	-	-	-
Maryland	15,000 2	-	-	15,000 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	2,701 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,701 *
Minnesota	25,000 4	-	-	-	-	-	25,000 4	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	7,500 1	-	7,500 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	10,000 2	10,000 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Dakota	6,071 2	-	6,071 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	41,136 8	-	-	10,550 2	11,117 2	19,469 4	-	-	-	-	-
Total Funds Received from Other State Sources	516,672 1	57,708 *	25,617 *	25,550 *	11,117 *	19,469 *	28,500 *	10,000 *	327,787 1	8,223 *	2,701 *

---

*Less than 0.5%

The directors of the agencies were asked what percentage of their state appropriations in fiscal 1974 -- excluding any federal funds -- were for the administration of the state arts agency. The proportion reported for administration ranged from less than 10% to 100%, with 15 agencies reporting that all funds appropriated by the state legislature were used for administrative purposes.

Table 5
PERCENTAGE OF STATE APPROPRIATION IN FISCAL 1974
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND FOR PROGRAM PURPOSES

	Administration	
	#	%
Total Agencies	55	100
1% - 9%	2	4
10% - 19%	15	27
20% - 29%	7	13
30% - 39%	4	7
40% - 49%	2	4
50% - 59%	2	4
60% - 69%	3	5
70% - 79%	3	5
80% - 89%	2	4
90% - 99%	-	-
100%	15	27

Average percentage 51%

The proportion of appropriated funds available for program purposes is greater among the larger agencies, with the percentage of state appropriations for administration of the agency declining sharply with an increase in total expenditures. This is a reflection of the fact that the major proportion of funds received by agencies in the lowest expenditure group are derived from the basic state agency grant, with correspondingly low appropriations, most of which must thus go for administrative purposes. The larger the appropriation, the higher the expenditures will be, and the greater the proportion of appropriations available for non-administrative purposes.

Table 6
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF STATE APPROPRIATION IN FISCAL 1974 FOR ADMINISTRATION PURPOSES

	(Base)	Administration %
Total	(55)	51
Total Expenditures		
Below $250,000	(15)	92
$250,000-$499,999	(20)	50
$500,000-$749,999	(10)	28
$750,000 and above	(10)	15

A Closer Look at Federal Funds

Funds from the federal government to the state arts agency were derived almost entirely from the National Endowment for the Arts. Funds from other federal sources totaled only $391,030, or 1% of the total funds received, while National Endowment for the Arts funds amounted to $11,617,020 or 26% of total funds. Excluding New York, National Endowment for the Arts funds represented 42% of total funds received.

The majority of funds from the National Endowment for the Arts were accounted for by the basic state agency grant. This block grant is given each year to all of the states in equal amounts: in fiscal 1974, $150,000. This sum was received by all of the agencies except those in American Samoa and Guam, which received basic state agency grants of $60,000 and $55,509 respectively. The basic state agency grants totaled $8,065,509, 18% of total funds received, and 29% excluding New York State.

In addition to the basic agency grant, every agency except those in American Samoa, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico received other Endowment grants amounting to $3,551,511, 8% of total funds received. (Other Endowment grants accounted for 13% of total funds excluding New York State.) However, the proportion of total funds accounted for by other Endowment grants rose as high as 31% ($147,838) of total funds received by the Washington State Arts Commission and 32% ($92,150) of total funds received by the Louisiana Council for Music and the Performing Arts.

Endowment grants other than the basic state agency grants were largely accounted for by grants for the Artists-in-Schools and Dance Touring Programs, and by program grants. A very small portion, $77,158, represented Endowment Treasury Fund grants (not including private portions) that were received in four states: Arkansas, Minnesota, Nebraska and South Carolina.

The only major sources of federal funds aside from the National Endowment for the Arts were the Office of Education and the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Eighteen agencies received $90,341 during their fiscal year 1974 in manpower training funds from the Office of Education; these funds for a poetry program were distributed through the St. Paul Arts Council. An additional $158,500 from the Office of Education was received by agencies in Puerto Rico ($61,500) and Texas ($97,000). The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was the source of $51,776 received in Texas and $50,000 in Washington.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7

SOURCES OF OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS IN FISCAL 1974
AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED

	Total	Office of Education		American Revolution Bicentennial Commission	Emergency Employment Act	Bureau of Indian Affairs	National Parks Service	Smithsonian Institution	U.S. Forest Service
		Manpower Training	Other						
	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%
Alabama	5,000 1	5,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	6,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	6,000 1	-	-
Arizona	12,002 4	5,000 2	-	-	-	7,002 2	-	-	-
Arkansas	3,000 1	3,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	4,120 2	4,120 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	5,000 1	5,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	3,000 1	3,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Idaho	5,000 3	5,000 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	5,000 2	5,000 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kentucky	5,000 1	5,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	3,000 1	3,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Missouri	3,000 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000 *	-
Nebraska	3,000 1	3,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	10,000 1	10,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Mexico	500 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500 *
North Dakota	3,000 2	3,000 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ohio	5,000 *	5,000 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oregon	5,000 2	5,000 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puerto Rico	61,500 2	-	61,500 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	3,221 *	3,221 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Texas	158,776 21	10,000 1	97,000 13	51,776 7	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	3,000 1	3,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington	73,911 16	10,000 2		50,000 11	13,911 3	-	-	-	-
West Virginia	5,000 1	5,000 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Funds Received from Other Federal Sources	391,030 1	90,341 *	158,500 *	101,776 *	13,911 *	7,002 *	6,000 *	3,000 *	500 *

***Less than 0.5%**

A Closer Look at Private Funds

As noted earlier, only 2% of total funds received by state arts agencies in fiscal 1974 came from private sources. Foundations accounted for almost half of this amount, with $386,673 or 1% of total funds coming from foundations. Individuals accounted for $92,312, corporations $13,160, earnings $191,622, and other private sources $66,348.

Private sources provided a minimal amount of support overall to the state arts agencies in all but four states: in Indiana, 27% of total funds was received from private sources, the entire amount of $137,356 from foundations. In Texas 19% of total funds represented private support, 18% ($132,000) from foundations, 1% ($5,365) from individuals and less than 0.5% from earnings. In Michigan, 16% of total funds was from private sources, 3% ($25,000) from foundations, and 13% ($122,275) from earnings in revenue from Artrain. And in Alaska 14% of total funds ($70,153) was from the private sector, all of it from individuals.

Table 8

SOURCES OF PRIVATE FUNDS RECEIVED BY STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974, AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED

	Total $/%	Foundations $/%	Individuals $/%	Corporations $/%	Earnings $/%	Other $/%
Alabama	818	-	-	-	-	818
	*					*
Alaska	70,153	-	70,153	-	-	-
	14		14			
Arizona	12,155	-	2,000	5,000	-	5,155
	4		1	2		2
Arkansas	12,500	12,500	-	-	-	-
	3	3				
Connecticut	1,500	-	-	-	1,500	-
	*				*	
Delaware	2,402	-	755	500	147	
	1		*	*	*	
Georgia	5,000	-	-	5,000	-	-
	1			1		
Guam	1,485	-	-	485	-	1,000
	2			1		1
Hawaii	4,389	3,000	-	-	-	1,389
	1	*				*
Idaho	2,175	-	-	2,175	-	-
	1			1		
Indiana	137,356	137,356	-	-	-	-
	27	27				
Iowa	2,002	-	-	-	-	2,002
	1					1
Maine	806	-	-	-	806	-
	*				*	
Maryland	6,150	-	-	-	6,150	-
	1				1	
Michigan	147,275	25,000	-	-	122,275	-
	16	3			13	
Minnesota	34,161	25,567	8,594	-	-	-
	5	4	1			
Nebraska	11,441	10,000	1,441	-	-	-
	5	4	1			
Nevada	1,191	-	1,191	-	-	-
	1		1			
New Mexico	2,000	2,000	-	-	-	-
	1	1				
North Carolina	2,500	2,500	-	-	-	-
	1	1				

Table 8
SOURCES OF PRIVATE FUNDS RECEIVED BY STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974, AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED

	Total $/%	Foundations $/%	Individuals $/%	Corporations $/%	Earnings $/%	Other $/%
Puerto Rico	47,400 2	-	-	-	47,400 2	-
Rhode Island	23,609 6	-	-	-	-	23,609 6
South Carolina	21,750 3	21,750 3	-	-	-	-
South Dakota	476 *	-	476 *	-	-	-
Tennessee	3,416 1	-	-	-	3,416 1	-
Texas	138,723 19	132,000 18	5,365 1	-	1,358 *	-
Utah	500 *	-	-	-	500 *	-
Vermont	2,030 1	-	-	-	-	2,030 1
Virgin Islands	15,500 5	14,500 5	-	-	1,000 *	-
Virginia	7,070 2	-	-	-	7,070 2	-
Wyoming	2,837 1	500 *	2,337 1	-	-	-
Total Private Funds Received	720,770 2	386,673 1	92,312 *	13,160 *	191,622 *	37,003 *

Unlike the proportion of funds received from state appropriations, the percentage and sources of private funds was not significantly affected by the size of the total expenditures of agencies.

Overall, private funds do not constitute an important source of funds for state arts agencies. However, as noted in Chapter IV, private support of the arts was greatly stimulated by the agencies through matching funds.

Funds Received by Separate Associated Foundations*

A total of $2,041,251 was received in fiscal 1974 by the 12 active separate foundations associated with state arts agencies, and 40% of this amount, or $824,814, was from private sources. However, the large proportion of funds from private sources, particularly from earnings, is a result of the unique situation of the Connecticut Foundation for the Arts. This foundation, associated with the Connecticut Commission on the Arts, is the primary grant-making body for state funds, and the Foundation has been given an annually renewable loan by the state on which the interest may be used for the Foundation's activities. The Connecticut foundation received $482,240 in earned interest in fiscal 1974, 92% of the total funds received of $530,275.

Excluding Connecticut, separate associated foundations received $1,510,976 in fiscal 1974, with the largest proportions coming from the state arts agencies -- 44% or $659,806 -- and the National Endowment for the Arts -- 34% or $515,950 -- and only 20%, or $306,774, coming from private sources.

---

* The activites and programs in which the associated foundations are involved are described in Chapter III.

Table 9

FUNDS RECEIVED BY SEPARATE FOUNDATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974

	Total	State Arts Agency	Other State	National Endowment for the Arts	Private						Other
					Total	Corporations	Individuals	Foundations	Earnings	Other	
Colorado	93,993	-	-	66,820	16,573	1,600	-	6,083	8,890	-	10,600
	100			71	18	2		6	10		11
Connecticut	530,275	-	-	10,500	518,040	2,600	-	33,200	482,240	-	1,735
	100			2	98	*		6	92		*
Florida	7,238	-	-	-	7,238	-	7,238	-	-	-	-
	100				100		100				
Illinois	156,357	-	-	49,750	106,607	-	24,951	-	1,375	80,281	-
	-			32	68		16		1	51	
Indiana	49,825	-	-	-	49,825	1,125	7,800	40,900	-	-	-
	100				100	2	16	82			
Massachusetts	217,100	124,500	-	92,600	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	100	57		43							
Michigan	85,969	-	-	-	85,969	44,400	8,935	30,000	2,634	-	-
	100				100	52	10	35	3		
Nebraska	23,667	20,000	-	-	3,045	-	1,000	10	35	2,000	622
	100	84			13		4	*	*	9	3
New York	808,549	514,306	-	260,038	34,205	-	5,000	26,269	2,936	-	-
	100	64		32	4		1	3	*		
Oregon	19,562	1,000	-	15,000	2,762	-	100	-	2,662	-	800
	-	5		77	14		1		13		4
South Carolina	48,166	-	16,424	31,742	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	100		34	66							
Wyoming	550	-	-	-	550	-	50	500	-	-	-
	100				100		9	91			
Total Funds Received by Associated Foundations	2,041,251	659,806	16,424	526,450	824,814	49,725	55,074	136,962	500,772	82,281	13,757
	100	32	1	26	40	2	3	7	24	4	1
Total Without Connecticut	1,510,976	659,806	16,424	515,950	306,774	47,125	55,074	103,762	18,532	82,281	12,022
	100	44	1	34	20	3	4	7	1	5	1

---

*Includes reimbursements and funds from local governments and school districts.

Expenditures

Expenditures of the state arts agencies in fiscal 1974 totaled $43,780,286. Eighty-six percent of this amount, or $37,491,082, was accounted for by expenditures for programs. $1,976,886 was expended by the separate foundations associated with the state arts agencies. (Specific project expenditures are detailed in Chapter IV.)

Program expenditures accounted for a strong majority of total expenditures in almost all states. However, accounting procedures differ in the means by which program administration and development costs are attributed, with some agencies including these costs as program expenditures and others not doing so. For this reason, agencies were asked to indicate the percentage of program expenditures used for development and administration of programs, and this percentage figure has been translated into a dollar amount on the following tables. It should be kept in mind that these are only estimates, and that percentages will vary according to accounting procedures. Furthermore, it should be remembered that those state agencies that conduct and administer their own programs will inevitably incur more administration costs than agencies that primarily fund projects administered by others.

Table 10

EXPENDITURES OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974

		Expenditures for Programs			
	Total $/%	Total $/%	Expenditures for Adminstration and Development of Programs 1/ $/%	Other Personnel Costs $/%	Other Administration Expenditures $/%
Alabama	384,850 100	259,859 68	(25,986) (7)	59,212 15	65,779 17
Alaska	500,774 100	417,374 83	(20,869) (4)	58,400 12	25,000 5
American Samoa	120,000 100	120,000 100	(-)	-	-
Arizona	311,485 100	242,785 78	(7,284) (2)	46,000 15	22,700 7
Arkansas	474,763 100	441,282 93	(26,477) (6)	24,139 5	9,342 2
California	1,242,511 100	1,013,748 82	(70,962) (6)	140,826 11	87,937 7
Colorado	319,975 100	229,012 71	(22,091) (7)	70,106 22	20,857 7
Connecticut	625,917 100	540,917 87	(-)	70,000 11	15,000 2
Delaware	244,209 100	213,903 87	(6,417) (13)	25,955 11	4,351 2
District of Columbia	201,900 100	149,900 75	(-)	30,925 15	21,075 10
Florida	505,693 100	415,798 82	(12,474) (2)	55,788 11	34,107 7
Georgia	443,617 100	373,617 84	(7,472) (2)	57,234 13	12,766 3
Guam	78,077 100	77,256 99	(10,043) (13)	-	821 1
Hawaii	777,727 100	720,973 93	(72,097) (9)	47,474 6	9,280 1
Idaho	183,508 100	163,508 90	(19,621) (11)	15,452 8	4,548 2
Illinois	873,541 100	733,335 84	(-)	63,069 7	77,137 9

(Continued)

Table 10
EXPENDITURES OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974
(Continued)

		Expenditures for Programs			
	Total $/%	Total $/%	Expenditures for Administration and Development of Programs $/%	Other Personnel Costs $/%	Other Administration Expenditures $/%
Indiana	498,937	360,648	(-)	107,429	30,860
	100	72		22	6
Iowa	291,285	248,444	(24,844)	33,405	9,436
	100	86	(9)	11	3
Kansas	261,059	200,425	(-)	47,720	12,914
	100	77		18	5
Kentucky	427,754	341,509	(3,415)	58,049	28,196
	100	79	(1)	14	7
Louisiana	286,150	242,150	(14,529)	35,000	9,000
	100	85	(5)	12	3
Maine	385,569	311,523	(3,115)	59,046	15,000
	100	81	(1)	15	4
Maryland	719,352	633,837	(126,767)	55,015	30,500
	100	88	(18)	8	4
Massachusetts	769,812	634,724	(69,820)	97,439	37,649
	100	82	(9)	13	5
Michigan	939,439	856,362	(154,145)	54,376	28,701
	100	91	(16)	6	3
Minnesota	695,227	591,483	(70,978)	60,517	43,227
	100	85	(10)	9	6
Mississippi	301,298	225,630	(33,845)	31,324	44,344
	100	75	(11)	10	15
Missouri	828,706	745,847	(-)	47,613	35,246
	100	90		6	4
Montana	227,092	195,723	(45,016)	19,160	12,209
	100	87	(20)	8	5
Nebraska	239,579	196,211	(-)	29,298	14,070
	100	82		12	6
Nevada	188,836	152,837	(18,340)	19,185	16,814
	100	81	(10)	10	9
New Hampshire	238,192	184,918	(-)	33,839	19,435
	100	78		14	8

(Continued)

Table 10
EXPENDITURES OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974
(Continued)

	Total	Expenditures for Programs		Other Personnel Costs	Other Administration Expenditures
		Total	Expenditures for Administration and Development of Programs		
	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%	$/%
New Jersey	921,675 100	871,675 94	(8,717) (1)	35,000 4	15,000 2
New Mexico	244,295 100	184,298 76	(9,215) (4)	34,654 14	25,343 10
New York	16,596,939 100	15,146,010 91	(605,840) (4)	1,086,788 7	364,141 2
North Carolina	422,103 100	373,817 84	(7,476) (2)	61,261 14	7,025 2
North Dakota	179,100 100	173,000 96	(6,920) (4)	3,000 2	3,100 2
Ohio	1,084,075 100	929,304 86	(18,586) (2)	111,378 10	43,393 4
Oklahoma	296,753 100	141,385 48	(-)	94,670 32	60,698 20
Oregon	271,713 100	207,150 76	(14,501) (5)	58,570 22	5,993 2
Pennsylvania	1,051,427 100	857,576 82	(102,909) (10)	126,818 12	67,033 6
Puerto Rico	2,756,370 100	2,065,230 75	(1,404,356) (51)	517,370 19	173,770 6
Rhode Island	437,933 100	372,425 85	(48,415) (11)	48,298 11	17,210 4
South Carolina	713,755 100	491,912 69	(-)	139,797 20	82,046 11
South Dakota	265,032 100	204,133 77	(40,827) (15)	42,836 16	18,063 7
Tennessee	524,313 100	393,446 75	(-)	75,262 14	55,605 11
Texas	747,140 100	664,795 89	(73,127) (10)	49,660 7	32,685 4

(Continued)

Table 10
EXPENDITURES OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974
(Continued)

		Expenditures for Programs			
	Total $/%	Total $/%	Expenditures for Administration and Development of Programs $/%	Other Personnel Costs $/%	Other Administration Expenditures $/%
Utah	256,126 100	208,916 81	(4,178) (2)	35,170 14	12,040 5
Vermont	240,766 100	173,847 73	(6,954) (3)	41,893 17	25,026 10
Virgin Islands	343,167 100	268,167 78	(-)	54,700 16	20,300 6
Virginia	402,207 100	353,542 88	(60,102) (15)	35,002 9	13,663 3
Washington	470,164 100	339,992 73	(-)	81,565 17	48,607 10
West Virginia	542,280 100	505,120 93	(-)	37,160 7	-
Wisconsin	213,335 100	171,108 80	(5,133) (2)	25,024 12	17,203 8
Wyoming	192,784 100	158,696 82	(3,174) (2)	16,940 9	17,148 9
Total Expenditures in Fiscal 1974	43,780,286 100	37,491,082 86	3,287,847 (8)	4,365,811 10	1,923,393 4
Total Without New York	27,183,347 100	22,345,072 82	2,682,007 (10)	3,279,023 12	1,559,252 6

1/ Expenditures for administration and development of programs are projections from figures on the percentages of program funds used in this area.

In addition to the expenditures made directly by the state arts agencies, $1,976,886 was expended by separate foundations associated with them. As noted earlier, the Connecticut foundation is the primary grant-making body for state funds, and the $405,264 expended was accounted for by such grants.

Table 11

EXPENDITURES OF SEPARATE FOUNDATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH STATE ARTS AGENCIES IN FISCAL 1974

	Total $
Colorado	100,823
Connecticut	405,264
Florida	5,035
Illinois	211,337
Indiana	35,373
Massachusetts	217,100
Michigan	53,446
Nebraska	23,582
New York	857,198
Oregon	19,562
South Carolina	48,166
Total	1,976,886
Total Without New York	1,119,688

Budget Submissions

In the area of budget and finances, the survey explored the procedures and processes through which budget requests are submitted to the state legislature, including the period for which appropriations are made.

. A majority of agencies receive an annual state appropriation, but slightly more than one-third receive a biennial appropriation, usually with different amounts specified for the two years.

Table 12
TYPE OF STATE APPROPRIATION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Annual Appropriation	35	64
Biennial Appropriation	20	36
Legislature specifies different amounts for the two years	15	27
Amount may be expended over the two-year period as agency chooses	3	5
Appropriation must be divided equally between the two years	1	2
25% of each budget line cannot be spent until last quarter	1	2

Whether an agency receives an annual or biennial appropriation, most fiscal years begin on July 1. Only four of the 55 agencies have fiscal years beginning on any other day of the year.

Table 13
FISCAL YEAR COVERING FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Annual:		
July 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974	33	60
September 1, 1973 - August 31, 1974	1	2
April 1, 1973 - March 31, 1974	1	2
Biennial:		
July 1, 1973 - June 30, 1975	15	27
July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1974	3	5
September 1, 1973 - August 31, 1975	1	2
October 1, 1973 - September 30, 1975	1	2

Type of Budget Submitted

In a slight majority (53%) of the states the budget submitted to the state legislature in fiscal 1974 is, at least in part, a line-item budget, while in 36% of the states the budget is for broad categories only and in 11% only an overall amount is submitted to the legislature. A strong majority of those agencies that submitted line-item or broad category budgets, or a combination of both, were required to make such submissions.

Table 14
TYPE OF BUDGET SUBMITTED TO STATE LEGISLATURE FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies #	Total Agencies %
Total	55	100
Budget for Broad Categories	20	36
Requirement	15	27
Preference	5	9
Combination of Broad Categories and Line Items	19	35
Requirement	19	35
Preference	-	-
Line-Item Budget	10	18
Requirement	9	16
Preference	1	2
Overall Amount Only	6	11

A somewhat larger proportion of low expenditure agencies -- in which, as previously noted, a larger proportion of state appropriation are for administrative purposes -- submit line-item budgets, but no consistent pattern in the type of budget submitted is evident by expenditure size.

Table 15
TYPE OF BUDGET SUBMITTED TO STATE LEGISLATURE FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

	Total Agencies		EXPENDITURES							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000 -$749,999		$750,000 and above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Budget for broad categories	20	36	4	27	8	40	5	50	3	30
Combinations of broad categorical line items	19	35	3	20	8	40	3	30	5	50
Line-item budget	10	18	5	33	3	15	1	10	1	10
Overall amount only	6	11	3	20	1	5	1	10	1	10

Agencies that submit line-item budgets most often cited as the line items detailed in those budgets specific activities or art forms (4 agencies), salaries and personnel costs, and administration (3 agencies each). The broad categories most often cited were program areas and programming in general (9 agencies), types of activities and art forms (7), and administration (6).

In most of the agencies with line items in their budget submissions, funds that are budgeted for one line item can be used for other purposes, although this usually requires permission from another person or agency.

Table 16
WHETHER FUNDS BUDGETED FOR ONE LINE ITEM CAN BE USED FOR OTHER PURPOSE AFTER STATE APPROPRIATION HAS BEEN MADE

(Base: Agencies whose fiscal 1975 budget submission was a line-item budget or included line items)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	29	100
Funds Can Be Used for Other Purposes	19	66
Necessary to obtain permission	12	42
Not necessary to obtain permission	7	24
Funds Cannot Be Used for Other Purposes	10	34

In 8 of the 12 agencies in which permission must be obtained, this permission must be sought from the state budget officer or comptroller, in 2 from the department of administration, and in 1 each from the department of finance and from the governor.

Observation

Thus, although a majority of agencies submitted a line-item budget, at least in part, in fiscal 1974, the types of line items varied widely, and even where funds are appropriated for a line item, in most cases these funds can be used for other purposes.

In submitting budgets to the state legislature, a majority (55%) of agencies make separate requests for program and for administrative funds, and another 9% request program and administrative funds together with a percentage of the allocation.

Table 17

SEPARATION OF PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS IN BUDGET SUBMISSIONS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Agencies with state program funds	40	73
Program and administrative funds requested separately	30	55
Program and administrative funds requested together with percentage allocation	5	9
No separation between program and administrative funds	5	9
No state program funds	15	27

The Program Planning Budgeting System (PPBS) or a similar type of system -- in which budgeting is done under a system of categories of public service and subcategories of the program results expected in terms of serving the public -- is being used in more than a third of the states. When asked whether they were required to use PPBS or a similar system, 21 agencies (38%) reported such requirements.

Methods of Submission of Budget

An overwhelming majority of agencies must submit their budget to the legislature through another individual, agency or office -- including most agencies that are autonomous state agencies -- and in most of these the budget is substantially revised by that person or office before final submission to the legislature.

Table 18

WHETHER BUDGET IS SUBMITTED TO LEGISLATURE THROUGH ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL, AGENCY OR OFFICE

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Budget Is Submitted through Another Individual, Agency or Office	51	93
Budget is revised substantially	28	51
Budget generally submitted to legislature as drawn up	23	42
Budget Submitted Directly to Legislature	4	7

The state finance or budget department, the governor and the administration department are the most likely channels through which budgets are submitted.

Table 19
INDIVIDUAL, AGENCY OR OFFICE THROUGH WHICH BUDGET* IS SUBMITTED TO STATE LEGISLATURE

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total Agencies in Which Budget Is Submitted through Another Individual, Agency or Office	51	93
Department of finance/budget/comptroller	34	62
Governor/executive department	20	36
Department of administration	8	15
Department of which agency is a part**	7	13
Legislative fiscal bureau or committee	7	13
Department of education	3	5
Department of cultural affairs	2	4
State department	1	2
Department of human resources	1	2
Personnel office	1	2
Department of Conservation	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

**Includes education, cultural affairs, state, education and planning departments, not listed separately, in which arts agencies are a subordinate agency, division or office.

In 95% of the state agencies the director or other members of the agency had the opportunity actually to appear before commissions, committees or subcommittees of the legislature in behalf of the budget requests covering fiscal 1974, with appearance being made before a wide variety of senate, house and joint committees and subcommittees on finance, budget, appropriations, ways and means, education, human resources, and the arts.

Table 20

WHETHER DIRECTOR OR MEMBER OF THE AGENCY APPEARED BEFORE LEGISLATURE IN BEHALF OF FISCAL 1974 BUDGET

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Did appear before committee, commission or subcommittee of legislature	52	95
Did not appear	3	5

Of the 52 agencies in which members appeared before the legislature, 33 generally make annual appearances and 18 biennial appearances, with the time period varying in the remaining agency. Testimony in behalf of the budget requests of the 3 agencies from which no member personally appeared was made by the Director of the Office of Planning and Budget in one case, the head of the department of human resources in one, and the head of the budget and fiscal office in the third.

In the exploration of budget submissions, the directors were asked what if any trends or shifts in the manner of such submission they foresee in the near future. Approximately half do feel that such trends and shifts will occur.

Table 21
WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE MANNER OF BUDGET SUBMISSIONS ARE FORESEEN AS COMING IN 3 TO 5 YEARS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	28	51
No trends or shifts	27	49

In response to an open-end question, those who believe trends or shifts will occur mentioned many types of developments they believe may occur, often of a very specific nature, such as the breakdown of travel into different categories. The trends mentioned by at least two directors, however, are shown in the following table.

Table 22
TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE MANNER OF BUDGET SUBMISSION* FORESEEN AS COMING IN 3 TO 5 YEARS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total Agencies That Foresee Trends or Shifts	28	51
Appropriations will be made for program funds	7	13
No longer submit line-item budget	3	5
Increase in line-item budgeting	2	4
Submission of budget in semi-autonomous manner	2	4
PPBS system will be introduced	2	4
Political pressure for geographic distribution of funds	2	4
Increase in administrative funds	2	4

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question

CHAPTER II

PURPOSES, FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES

PURPOSES, FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES

This chapter explores the purposes and functions of state arts agencies from three primary viewpoints:

-- mandated purposes: The first section of the chapter reviews the enabling legislation or executive orders under which the state arts agencies function, and the purposes of the agencies as spelled out in these.

-- functions and practices: The second section details which of a list of 49 possible functions and practices agencies are now engaged in, which they may have been engaged in in the past and discontinued, and which they would like to be engaged in but are not now.

-- factors affecting functions and practices: The third section presents the directors' evaluation of the importance of a number of specific factors on the functions and practices of their agencies.

Mandated Purposes

The basic purposes of state arts agencies are mandated in the legislation or executive orders by which they were created. These mandated purposes, however, are usually broadly stated; their implementation can be brought about through a great variety of functions and practices. Furthermore, in a majority of the states, the mandated purposes are either identical or very similar to one another.

These mandated purposes are based for the most part on the legislation that created the New York and the Missouri agencies. The legislation for the New York State Council on the Arts, which was originally established as a temporary commission in 1960 and was made a permanent agency in 1965, was based in turn on the arts-agency experience of Great Britain. In view of the subsequent development in the several states, and especially in light of the recent arts funding levels in New York, it is interesting to note that New York's enabling legislation clearly did not contemplate a funding agency on a significant scale, as the New York State Council later became, nor did it provide for an organization appropriate to that purpose. When the funding of the New York State Council was greatly increased, during the early 1970s, the language of the enabling legislation was in effect superseded by that of the appropriation acts, which themselves set forward numerous conditions, including the purposes for which the enlarged funds were being provided, namely, "to the end that grants hereunder will provide maximum encouragement and assistance for the maintenance and development of the public availability of the cultural resources of the State" (emphasis added).

The purposes mandated for the New York agency at the time of its creation were:

> "1. To stimulate and encourage throughout the state the study and presentation of the performing and fine arts and public interest and participation therein;
>
> "2. To make such surveys as may be deemed advisable of public and private institutions engaged within the state in artistic and cultural activities, including but not limited to music, theatre, dance, painting, sculpture, architecture, and allied arts and crafts, and to make recommendations concerning appropriate methods to encourage participation in and appreciation of the arts to meet the legitimate needs and aspirations of persons in all parts of the state;
>
> "3. To take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to encourage public interest in the cultural heritage of our state and to expand the state's resources."

The legislation for the Missouri agency -- first established as a Governor's Committee in 1962 and officially approved as a Council by the legislature in 1965 -- retained those three purposes and added a fourth:

> "4. To encourage and assist freedom of artistic expression essential for the well-being of the arts."

The laws setting up most state arts agencies contain either the three originally mandated purposes of the New York agency or all four of the Missouri agency. Indeed, a handbook published in 1966, The Politics of Art, Forming a State Arts Council*, contains a model law which includes the four purposes and which was copied by many states. (The text of the model law is contained in Appendix A.)

The states in which the mandated purposes conform generally to this model are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virgin Islands, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. In Colorado, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania the agencies are in addition mandated to assist communities and/or organizations on the local level in creating their own cultural and artistic programs. Tennessee follows the model law but specifies the study and encouragement of "performing, visual and literary arts"; furthermore, the Tennessee agency -- like that of American Samoa -- is mandated to administer a museum and govern its operation.

---

* Published by Associated Councils of the Arts.

Agencies whose mandated purposes are other than those stated in the New York/Missouri model tend to have either very broadly conceived general purposes or specific mandates for more detailed goals. Among those states with broad, general mandates -- with no specific purposes mentioned other than the encouragement, support, stimulation or development of the arts within the state -- are American Samoa, District of Columbia, Guam, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, Vermont, Virginia and Washington.

The Politics of Art handbook also contains a model preamble, defining the conditions or circumstances which require the existence of the agency. The text of this model is as follows:

> "It is hereby found that many of our citizens lack the opportunity to view, enjoy, or participate in living theatrical performances, musical concerts, operas, dance and ballet recitals, art exhibits, examples of fine architecture, and the performing and fine arts generally. It is hereby further found that, with increasing leisure time, the practice and enjoyment of the arts are of increasing importance and that the general welfare of the people of the state will be promoted by giving further recognition to the arts as a vital aspect of our culture and heritage and as a valued means of expanding the scope of our educational programs.
>
> "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the state to join with private patrons and with institutions and professional organizations concerned with the arts to insure that the role of the arts in the life of our communities will continue to grow and will play an even more significant part in the welfare and educational experience of our citizens."

With minor variations, a preamble similar to this is found in the enabling legislation or executive orders creating a state council or commission in Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Maryland, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota and the Virgin Islands.

A number of states manage to avoid the emphasis placed in the preamble on "lack of opportunity" by describing the more positive purposes for a state arts agency. A number refer to the importance of the arts in developing the economy (American Samoa, Idaho, Iowa, Maryland, Rhode Island and South Dakota) while a smaller number (Guam and Texas) specifically mention the promotion of tourism and, in the case of Texas, the attraction of permanent residents. A number also refer to the potential for increase in employment (California, Iowa, Maryland and New Mexico), and to the aiding and training of individual artists (Alaska, Illinois and Oregon). Washington, uniquely, points out that it has already produced many artists of national and international reputation.

It is rare that the mandated purposes go beyond the range of the model text. Again only Washington speaks of the "preservation and development of beauty" as one of its objectives, and only Arkansas and Florida acknowledge the encouragement of "creativity" as a legitimate purpose for a governmental entity. As might be expected, American Samoa and Alaska make special mention of maintaining and encouraging native or ethnic arts, but a surprisingly large number of states (Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, Maryland, New York, Oregon, and Tennessee) refer to the maintenance of professional artistic standards or "excellence." A surprisingly small number of states, on the other hand, make any reference to the relationship between the arts and education, among them Guam, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Tennessee and Utah -- Delaware going so far as to refer to the capability of the arts to "inspire" children. The language of the Tennessee legislation is particularly eloquent: "The arts are an essential tool for the cultivation of sensibility, for just as muscular development and intellectual vigor are fruitless unless directed to some worthy human work, so increased perceptive power is barren without the discrimination of value that is the creative force of the arts."

Beginning in 1965, many state councils or commissions were officially designated as the state agency to receive federal funds for the arts. These include Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia and Wyoming. Many others had been, or soon became, authorized to apply for, receive, and disburse federal funds, or to co-operate or enter into agreements with the federal government. These include California, the District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia and Wisconsin. A number (Oklahoma, Texas and Washington are examples) are simply authorized to receive funds, grants, or gifts from any source. During the same period of the late 1960s a number of agencies also either came into being, or redesignated themselves, with the phrase "and humanities" added to their title, reflecting the parallelism of arts and humanities at the national level. These include Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Oklahoma and Texas, Virginia and West Virginia.

In two cases (Guam and Tennessee), it is specifically declared that arts programs under the act are not intended for an elite but for the general public broadly defined, Louisiana going so far as to speak of enriching and fulfilling the lives of its citizens. One or two specific programs assigned to an agency also give a sense of purpose, as in the naming of a poet laureate in Washington, or in the honors program of Oregon. More often, however, it is the powers given to, or withdrawn from, the agency that suggest an intention behind this action. For example, a small number (Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas) authorize the arts agency to promote and advise on the use of art in state facilities. In terms of powers withdrawn, though many adopt the clause relating to artistic freedom from the Missouri model, at least one (Colorado) goes further and includes a strong non-interference clause prohibiting the agency from attempting to influence or determine the artistic decisions of arts organizations.

The purposes of a number of the agencies are set out in a more detailed way, although frequently these do parallel the purposes of the model law:

-- The Arkansas agency is mandated to carry out a program of grants-in-aid to groups or individuals engaged in or concerned with the arts to enable them to provide or support productions of substantial artistic and cultural significance, giving emphasis to creativity and the maintenance and encouragement of professional excellence, to carry out projects that will encourage and assist artists and enable them to achieve standards of professional excellence, and other relevant projects including surveys, research and planning in the arts.

-- Under the original 1963 law, the California Arts Commission was mandated to make a comprehensive survey of public and private institutions engaged in artistic and cultural activities; to determine the legitimate needs and aspirations culturally and artistically of citizens; to ascertain how resources in existence and those which should be brought into existence are to serve the cultural needs and aspirations of the citizens; and to assist communities in originating and creating their own cultural and artistic programs. In 1975 the Commission was abolished and a 1975 legislative act established the California Arts Council for the purpose of encouraging artistic awareness, participation and expression, helping independent local groups develop their own arts programs, promoting employment of artists and those skilled in crafts, and providing for the exhibition of art works in public buildings throughout California.

-- In Florida, where the original enabling legislation was based on the model law, a 1975 act mandates the arts agency to provide fine arts grants to supplement the financial support of productions with substantial artistic and cultural significance emphasizing American creativity, and of productions meeting professional standards that, without such assistance, would otherwise be unavailable to citizens of Florida.

-- The Hawaii law states that the agency shall assist in the coordination of plans, programs and activities concerned with the preservation and furtherance of culture and the arts; devise programs to bring the arts to those who would otherwise not have the opportunity to participate; stimulate, guide and promote culture and the arts; devise and recommend legislative and administrative action for the preservation and furtherance of culture and the arts; study the availability of private and governmental grants, and accept, disburse and allocate funds from such sources for the preservation and furtherance of culture and the arts.

-- The Illinois law states that the agency should identify existing legislation, policies and programs affecting the arts and evaluate their effectiveness, stimulate public understanding and recognition of the importance of cultural institutions in Illinois, promote an encouraging atmosphere for creative artists residing in Illinois, and encourage the use of local resources for the development and support of the arts.

-- The Maryland agency is mandated to design new or expanded programs in the arts, to encourage and assist in the formation of community arts councils, to provide technical and consultative assistance to arts organizations, to assist in the touring of professional performances and exhibitions from within and without the state, to make awards for excellence in the arts, and to make grants to arts organizations and individual artists.

-- The New Mexico agency is mandated to advise and assist public agencies in planning civic beautification, to foster appreciation for the fine arts, to make New Mexico more appealing to the world, to encourage creative activity in the arts by residents, and to attract to the state's residency additional outstanding creators in the field of the fine arts.

-- The purposes of the North Carolina agency are focused on the study, collection, maintenance and dissemination of factual data and pertinent information relative to the arts; assistance to local organizations and the community at large; the exchange of information, promotion of programs and stimulation of joint endeavors between public and non-public programs; the identification of research needs in the arts and encouragement of such research; and the bringing of the highest quality arts to the state and promoting maximum opportunity for the people to experience and enjoy those arts.

-- The Ohio agency is mandated to foster and encourage the development of the arts in the state and the preservation of the state's cultural heritage, with specific function set forth in the law to conduct a survey of the state's cultural and artistic resources and needs and to maintain a continuing inventory of such resources, to develop a plan for better and fuller use of such resources by all the people of the state, and to assess the role of the arts in the growth and development of the state.

-- The Oregon law states that the agency's objectives are to complement, assist and strengthen existing or planned programs and activities of public and private associations in the arts to promote the broadest public benefit, to encourage and give greater opportunities and recognition to Oregon artists, and to stimulate and encourage private and local initiative and financial support in connection with programs and activities in the arts.

-- The South Dakota agency is mandated to promote, stimulate and encourage the arts, to conduct research and provide a plan for the development of the arts in the state, to coordinate activities of the federal, state and local governments and the state's institutions in relation to the arts, and to approve projects for federal and state aid for the arts.

-- In Texas the agency is mandated to foster the development of a receptive climate for the arts that will enrich and benefit the state's citizens, make visits to Texas more appealing to the world and attract additional creators in the fine arts to residency in the state, and to direct other activities such as sponsoring art lectures and exhibitions and the central compilation and dissemination of information on the arts. The agency is also mandated to act as an advisor to other state agencies to provide a concentrated effort for the arts, to act in an advisory capacity relative to the creation, acquisition, construction, erection or remodeling by the state of any work of art and to the artistic character of buildings constructed, erected or remodeled by the state.

-- The Utah agency, whose origins reach back to 1899, is mandated to advance the interests of the fine arts, including literature and music; to develop the influence of art, literature and music in the adult educational field; to associate manufacturers, agriculturalists and industrialists in these endeavors; to utilize broadcasting and newspapers in disseminating information on the arts; and to take all necessary and useful means to stimulate a more abundant production of an indigenous art, literature and music.

-- The Wisconsin agency is mandated continually to study the artistic and cultural activities within the state, assist arts activities, assist communities in creating and developing their own arts programs, and encourage and assist freedom of artistic expression.

In summary, the mandated purposes of the state arts agency are generally broad in scope and allow for diverse activities within the agency. Even those legislated purposes that are more specific in nature tend to include such an objective as "encouragement of the arts", in the fulfillment of which a variety of functions and practices can be undertaken.

Functions and Practices

The study of functions and practices in state arts agencies was centered on a list of 49 possible functions and practices that was drawn up by consultant agency directors to represent, as far as possible, the broad range of arts agency activities. For each of these functions and practices, agency directors were asked whether they had done it in fiscal 1974 -- on a scale of "did a lot", "did some", "did not do", and "not a proper function and practice of the agency" -- and, if they had done it, whether they planned to continue, or if not, whether they had in the past or would like to in the future.

The responses thus indicate the subjective evaluations by directors of their agencies' degree of involvement in the functions and practices listed, and the data should be considered in this light.

Of the 54 agencies responding to this question, all but nine did a majority of the 49 items in fiscal 1974, and on the average agencies were engaged in 32 of the 49 functions and practices. Every agency reported that in fiscal 1974 they did "make expenditures to cultural organizations for specific projects: and did "make accessible quality arts", with the number of agencies doing a listed function and practice declining to 14 who did "make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of awards" and 8 who did "make expenditures to audience groups/sponsors/presenters for them to spend as they wish." The 49 functions and practices and the numbers of agencies who did them in fiscal 1974 are shown on the following table:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 23
FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES

	Did In Fiscal 1974					
	Total	Did A Lot	Did Some	Did Not Do	Not A Proper Function	Not Answered
	#	#	#	#	#	#
1. Make expenditures to cultural organizations for specific projects	54	49	5			
2. Make accessible quality arts	54	43	11			
3. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve artistic excellence	53	33	20	1		
4. Make expenditures to audience groups/sponsors/presenters for specific projects	50	32	18	4		
5. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve audience development	50	22	28	3	1	
6. Make expenditures to cultural organizations for educational or teaching purposes	49	25	24	2	3	
7. Make expenditures to non-professionals	48	27	21	3	3	
8. Encourage state and local education agencies to increase their commitment to the arts	48	21	27	6		
9. Have cooperative programming with community arts councils	47	21	26	6	1	
10. Pay professionals for their services to this agency	46	31	15	7	1	
11. Make expenditures to cultural organizations for their own residencies combining teaching and performing over an extended period	46	12	34	7	1	
12. Provide amateur groups the funding for hiring a professional, such as a curator, conductor, or director	45	15	30	6	3	
13. Make expenditures to elementary and secondary schools to enable them to bring professional individual artists or cultural groups to students	44	23	21	7	3	
14. Make expenditures to colleges and universities to enable them to bring professional individual artists or cultural groups to students	43	16	27	9	2	
15. Fund art events or projects such as arts in prison, arts for a drug abuse center, for mental patients, etc.	43	6	37	10	1	
16. Supplement the teaching of the arts in elementary and secondary schools with professional level instruction in such areas as creative writing, art, dance, theatre, music, etc.	42	19	23	3	9	
17. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve management	42	8	34	9	3	
18. Encourage mayors, city councils, county executives, etc. to include the arts in their budgets	40	13	27	12	1	1
19. Encourage visual arts groups to secure professional jurors by providing funds for this purpose	39	11	28	14	1	
20. Insist on recipients of funds paying professional artists whenever they provide services	39	27	12	13	2	
21. Make expenditures to cultural organizations for ticket subsidy	39	10	29	13	2	
22. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to experiment on their own	39	6	33	13	2	
23. Make expenditures for adult education in the arts	37	7	30	13	4	
24. Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of commissions (not including work grants or purchase grants)	37	6	31	16	1	
25. Fund programs in the environmental arts and architecture	36	8	28	17	1	
26. Engage in cooperative activities with Musicians Union, Artists Equity, American Institute of Architects and other professional arts organizations	36	4	32	16	2	
27. Employ different standards in reviewing fund applications for fully professional endeavors, semi-professional endeavors and amateur endeavors	34	17	17	15	5	
28. Make expenditures for writers' seminars	33	2	31	20	1	
29. Fund arts programs of organizations like Model Cities, community action agencies, etc.	32	8	24	20	2	
30. Make expenditures to schools offering special training in the arts, such as conservatories, dance schools, art schools, drama schools, etc.	32	6	26	20	2	
31. Make expenditures to publishing companies and/or scholarly or artistic presses	32	3	29	18	4	
32. Try to develop a professional cultural organization in your state -- such as a dance company, opera company, museum, string quartet, drama company, etc. -- because need for one exists	31	9	22	17	6	
33. Employ different standards in reviewing fund applications for different geographical locations	30	10	20	20	4	
34. Make expenditures to cultural organizations for general support	30	9	21	19	5	
35. Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of work grants	30	5	25	20	4	

(continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 23

FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES (continued)

	Did In Fiscal 1974					
	Total #	Did A Lot #	Did Some #	Did Not Do #	Not A Proper Function #	Not Answered #
36. Make non-monetary awards to, or otherwise recognize, individual artists	29	5	24	21	4	
37. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve salary levels	28	4	24	19	7	
38. Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of awards	28	3	25	23	3	
39. Make expenditures for historical preservation	27	6	21	18	9	
40. Have agency-administered programs, such as serving as management, touring, booking agent, etc.	27	5	22	23	4	
41. Support projects in the humanities	26	7	19	17	11	
42. Conduct own programs of training in arts management within the state arts agency	26	7	19	25	3	
43. Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of purchase grants	26	1	25	26	2	
44. Make expenditures for training in arts management, not conducted within the state arts agency	22	1	21	30	2	
45. Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of work grants	20	5	15	28	6	
46. Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of purchase grants	16	3	13	34	4	
47. Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of commissions (not including work grants or purchase grants)	14	6	8	33	7	
48. Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of awards	14	4	10	33	7	
49. Make expenditures to audience groups/sponsors/presenters for them to spend as they wish	8	2	6	31	15	

Almost all of the agencies who were engaging in a function or practice in fiscal 1974 reported that they plan to continue doing so. For only 10 of the listed items did any agency say that it would not continue (and a maximum of 2 agencies for any single item), and for 2 other items a state agency was not sure that it would continue. The reasons given by those few agencies not planning to continue centered on limited funds, lower ranking among the agency's priorities and the limited number of people affected.

It is evident that state arts agencies do not see their functions and practices as diminishing, considering the minimal number who plan to discontinue any of the items. Furthermore, as discussed below, many of those agencies who were not engaged in a practice in fiscal 1974 would like to do so and are primarily limited by funds.

Those agencies that were not doing a listed item in fiscal 1974 were asked whether or not they had done so in the past and, if so, why they no longer did so. Furthermore, they were asked whether they would like to engage in the practice and, if so, why they are not doing it now. The total number who did not do the item in fiscal 1974 (not including those who do not believe it is a proper function), those who did it in the past and those who would like to do it are shown in the following table:

Table 24

WHETHER AGENCIES HAVE PREVIOUSLY ENGAGED IN FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES NOT ENGAGED IN DURING FISCAL 1974, AND/OR WOULD LIKE TO IN THE FUTURE

		Did Not Do In Fiscal 1974 #	Did In Past #	Would Like To Do #
1.	Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of purchase grants	34	1	23
2.	Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of commissions	33	4	25
3.	Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of awards	33	-	24
4.	Make expenditures to audience groups/sponsors/presenters for them to spend as they wish	31	-	3
5.	Make expenditures for training in arts management, not conducted within the state arts agency	30	-	21
6.	Make expenditures directly to individual artists in the form of work grants	28	2	21
7.	Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of purchase grants	26	1	13
8.	Conduct own programs of training in arts management within the state arts agency	25	2	17
9.	Have agency-administered programs, such as serving as management, touring, booking agent, etc.	23	1	9
10.	Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of awards	23	-	13
11.	Make non-monetary awards to, or otherwise recognize, individual artists	21	4	14
12.	Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of work grants	20	-	10
13.	Employ different standards in reviewing fund applications for different geographical locations	20	-	2
14.	Make expenditures to schools offering special training in the arts, such as conservatories, dance schools, art schools, drama schools, etc.	20	3	14
15.	Fund arts programs of organizations like Model Cities, community action agencies, etc.	20	1	14
16.	Make expenditures for writers' seminars	20	4	16
17.	Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve salary levels	19	2	12
18.	Make expenditures to cultural organizations for general support	19	2	15
19.	Make expenditures for historical preservation	18	1	10
20.	Make expenditures to publishing companies and/or scholarly or artistic presses	18	2	15
21.	Support projects in the humanities	17	-	3
22.	Try to develop a professional cultural organization in your state -- such as a dance company, opera company, museum, string quartet, drama company, etc. -- because need for one exists	17	2	9
23.	Fund programs in the environmental arts and architecture	17	3	15
24.	Engage in cooperative activities with Musicians Union, Artists Equity, American Institute of Architects and other professional arts organizations	16	3	15
25.	Make expenditures through institutions to individual artists in the form of commissions	16	2	13
26.	Employ different standards in reviewing fund applications for fully professional endeavors, semi-professional endeavors and amateur endeavors	15	1	6
27.	Encourage visual arts groups to secure professional jurors by providing funds for this purpose	14	2	8
28.	Make expenditures for adult education in the arts	13	2	8
29.	Make expenditures to cultural organizations to experiment on their own	13	2	8
30.	Make expenditures to cultural organizations for ticket subsidy	13	-	10

(Continued)

Table 24

WHETHER AGENCIES HAVE PREVIOUSLY ENGAGED IN FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES NOT ENGAGED IN DURING FISCAL 1974, AND/OR WOULD LIKE TO IN THE FUTURE
(Continued)

	Did Not Do In Fiscal 1974	Did In Past	Would Like To Do
	#	#	#
31. Insist on recipients of funds paying professional artists whenever they provide services	14	-	3
32. Encourage mayors, city councils, county executives, etc. to include the arts in their budgets	12	1	11
33. Fund art events or projects such as arts in prison, arts for a drug abuse center, for mental patients, etc.	10	-	10
34. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve management	9	1	9
35. Make expenditures to colleges and universities to enable them to bring professional individual artists or cultural groups to students	9	2	5
36. Make expenditures to elementary and secondary schools to enable them to bring professional individual artists or cultural groups to students	7	-	4
37. Make expenditures to cultural organizations for their own residencies combining teaching and performing over an extended period	7	-	4
38. Pay professionals for their services to this agency	7	2	4
39. Provide amateur groups the funding for hiring a professional, such as a curator, conductor, or director	6	1	4
40. Have cooperative programming with community arts councils	6	2	6
41. Encourage state and local education agencies to increase their commitment to the arts	6	-	6
42. Make expenditures to audience groups/sponsors/presenters for specific projects	4	-	2
43. Supplement the teaching of the arts in elementary and secondary schools with professional level instruction in such areas as creative writing, art, dance, theatre, music, etc.	3	-	-
44. Make expenditures to non-professionals	3	-	2
45. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve audience development	3	-	3
46. Make expenditures to cultural organizations for educational or teaching purposes	2	-	-
47. Make expenditures to cultural organizations to improve artistic excellence	1	-	-

Of the few states which reported having discontinued engaging in a function or practice, the primary reason given for no longer doing it was limited funds. For 15 of the 28 items which at least one agency did in the past but no longer does, one of the reasons given for stopping was the lack of funds. Other reasons given include a lack of applications or interest, a change in policy or legislation, and lack of staff or time.

Lack of funds was also by far the most mentioned reason for not now engaging in a practice that an agency's director would like to do:

-- Lack of funds was given as a reason for not doing 40 of the 44 items that at least one agency would like to do but did not do in fiscal 1974. For 28 of those items, lack of funds was ranked at least equal to or above any other reason.

-- Lack of applications, interest or need was the second most mentioned reason. This was ranked highest as a reason for not making expenditures for ticket subsidy, not making expenditures for writers' seminars, not providing funds to visual arts groups for professional jurors, not making expenditures for training in arts management, not funding programs or organizations like Model Cities, community action agencies, etc., and with lack of staff was highest ranked as a reason for not engaging in cooperative activities with arts unions and professional arts organizations.

-- Lack of staff was also ranked highest as a reason for not conducting an agency's own program of arts management training, not having agency-administered programs, not having cooperative programming with community arts councils, and was ranked highest along with the low priority assigned to a practice as a reason for not encouraging state and local education agencies to increase their arts commitment.

-- The fact that the practice is against agency's policy or guidelines was the highest ranked reason for not employing different standards in reviewing fund applications for different levels of professionalism and for not making non-monetary awards to individual artists.

In addition, for 32 of the 44 items that agencies would like to do but did not do in fiscal 1974, at least one agency reported that they were engaging in the practice in fiscal 1975.

Trends and Shifts in Functions and Practices

When asked whether they foresee any trends or shifts in the functions and practices of their agencies during the coming three to five years, approximately three in four directors reported that they do foresee such trends or shifts:

Table 25

WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES OF AGENCY ARE FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	42	76
No trends or shifts	7	13
Not sure	6	11

When directors were asked in an open-end question what trends are foreseen, the volunteered responses indicated increased activity by the agency in areas in which they are already engaged.

Table 26
TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES*
FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that do foresee trends or shifts	42	76
Expansion of programs/increased program funding	14	25
Increased funding, services to individual artists	13	24
More community sponsorship/stronger links with community, business and citizens	10	18
Support of major institutions	8	15
Greater involvement of recipients in program planning/ closer relationship with arts organizations	7	13
Increased professional staff, administrative support	7	13
Increased participation of community councils	6	11
Greater definition of goals, more future planning	5	9
More sophisticated use of politics/greater community with legislature	5	9
Increased arts programs in schools	5	9
More council-initiated projects	4	7
Upgrading of arts organizations	4	7
Greater involvement in regional programming	3	5
Increased coordination of touring	2	4
More residencies	2	4
Greater emphasis on crafts, indigenous arts	2	4
Increased professionalism	1	2
Increased visibility of agency	1	2
Improved evaluation system	1	2
Increased technical assistance to non-professional groups	1	2
Increased grants to the humanities	1	2
Lessening support of the performing arts	1	2
General reduction in flow-through grant programs	1	2
More emphasis on recreation and parks	1	2
Greater interest in arts for senior citizens	1	2
More concern for historical preservations	1	2
More committee meetings	1	2
Regulation of business practice	1	2
Don't know	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question

A majority of the agencies that believe these trends will occur feel that they will result from increasing public awareness of and demand for the arts:

Table 27
REASONS WHY TRENDS AND SHIFTS FORESEEN IN FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES WILL OCCUR*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that do foresee trends or shifts	42	76
Response to increasing needs/pressure for more programs/growing public awareness	23	42
Increasing funding	10	18
Rising awareness by agencies of individual artist	8	15
Directions of council/commission planning	8	15
Growth of staff	7	13
Change of leadership, new administration	4	7
Director is optimistic	3	5
Everything changes	2	4
Shifting population	2	4
More responsive, sympathetic legislature	2	4
Increasing communication between artists, organizations and council/commission	1	2
Increased touring as a result of regional program	1	2
Increased growth of local arts agencies	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to open-end questions

Agency directors tend to be optimistic in their perception of the trends in agency functions during the coming years. Except for one agency that foresaw a lessening of support for the performing arts, all the trends foreseen are generally positive.

CHAPTER III
PROGRAMS

PROGRAMS

This chapter explores the overall programs of state arts agencies and the rules and policies of agencies that affect these programs. The areas covered include:

- program emphases: the directors' description of the major program emphases of their agencies
- restrictions and mandates: restrictions and prohibitions on the agencies' programs, other activities and fiscal practices, as well as programs that agencies are mandated to carry out.
- subgranting: the use of subgranting to effect those programs or projects an agency is prohibited from doing or prefers not to do directly
- earmarked funds: the earmarking or restriction of funds so that an agency has no discretionary power over the final distribution and use of the funds
- criteria for funding: the criteria employed for the consideration of application for funding, and the causes for the denial of such applications
- matching funds: agencies' policies concerning matching funds, including the percentage requirement for matching funds and the type of funds allowed as matches
- non-funding programs: the activities of the agencies in support of the arts other than the distribution of funds to organizations, institutions and individuals

- programs of associated foundations: the programs of the associated separate foundations and the earmarking of funds received by the associated foundations.

Program Emphases

In the examination of agency programs, directors were initially asked in an open-end question what were the various major program emphases of their agencies; the volunteered responses covered both broad program areas -- such as touring -- as well as specific art forms. The most mentioned program by far was support of community arts activities and councils, which a slight majority of 53% of directors listed among the major program emphases. Artists-in-schools, touring and expansion arts (such as multi-ethnic, prisons, aging, etc.) were each cited by approximately one-third of the agencies.

Table 28
MAJOR PROGRAM EMPHASES OF STATE ARTS AGENCY*

	Total Agencies #	Total Agencies %
Total	55	100
Support of community arts activities and organizations/development and support of community councils	29	53
Touring	18	33
Artists-in-schools	16	29
Funding of organizations, institutions	14	25
Special groups (multi-ethnic, prisons, aging, etc.)	13	24
Education	12	22
Technical assistance	11	20
Special projects	7	13
Support of major institutions	5	9
Visiting artists/artists' residencies	5	9
Informational services	4	7
Audience development	3	5
Training programs	2	4
Support of individual artists	2	4
Art in public places	1	2
Cultural promotion	1	2
Publications	1	2
Archives/libraries	1	2
Parks	1	2
Communications	1	2
Youth and art	1	2
Performing arts	16	29
Music	11	20
Theatre	9	16
Dance	8	15
Non-specific performing arts	5	9
Visual arts	13	24
Literature	6	11
Museums	6	11
Performing arts (non-specified)	5	9
Public media	5	9
Architecture/environmental arts	3	5
Folk arts	3	5
Crafts	2	4
Arts, non-specific	1	2
None	1	2

---

*Volunteered respones to an open-end question.

Observation:

The following chapter will analyze the programs in terms of projects and actual dollars expended on them. Consultant agency directors indicated, however, that the amount of money spent is not necessarily indicative of program emphases and priorities; e.g., a few project expenditures of relative high amounts to large organizations may require little time and effort by the agency and represent a small part of its programs, though the dollar amounts are large.

In judging whether the program balance in the future will tend more toward projects providing impact on various parts of the state, or more toward local or community projects than at the present time, a majority of directors estimate that programs will stay at about the same level as at the time of the survey, with approximately 1 in 5 agencies seeing a movement in each of the directions.

Table 29
PERCEIVED FUTURE BALANCE OF PROGRAMS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Stay about the same	29	53
Toward local/community projects	12	22
Toward projects for various parts of state	10	18
Not sure	3	5
Not applicable	1	2

Directors who feel future programs will tend more toward local or community projects cited the need for and requests for such assistance, the increasing local activity and development of community councils, and pressure for per capita distribution of funds. Those who feel the direction is toward statewide projects cited the commitment of the state in that direction, the development of state institutions and organizations, the needs within the state falling that way, and the general direction of the council/commission.

The directors' concern with support of community activities was again evident in estimation of program emphases during the coming years. When asked whether they feel that trends or shifts in program emphases will occur in the near future, a substantial majority of 64% of the directors do foresee such trends, and in an open-end question on what these trends will be community activities ranked highest among the trends foreseen. (Although regional programming was not mentioned in connection with this question, in another part of the interview directors indicated, as discussed in Chapter V, that they foresee a trend toward more regional programming.)

Table 30

TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN PROGRAM EMPHASES OF THE AGENCY FORESEEN IN THE COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total agencies in which trends or shifts are foreseen	35	64
More development of community arts activities, organizations and councils	15	27
More programs (non-specific)	10	18
More emphasis on individual artists	7	13
More funding	6	11
More touring	5	9
More media programming	3	5
More emphasis on education/artists-in-schools	2	4
More Bicentennial programs	1	3
Increased emphasis on:		
Theatre	2	4
Literature	2	4
Visual arts	2	4
Dance	2	4
Music	1	2
Agency will serve as major cultural resource, not just arts programming	3	5
Possible restructuring of grant-making procedures	1	2
Arts service organizations will grow	1	2
Depends on needs of community	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

When asked why such trends or shifts will occur, directors cited reasons centering on the agencies' response to existing needs and desires.

Table 31

REASONS WHY TRENDS OR SHIFTS FORESEEN IN PROGRAM EMPHASES OF THE AGENCY WILL OCCUR*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total agencies in which trends or shifts are foreseen	35	64
To meet needs and expressed desires, particularly of local communities	23	42
Increased funds available	10	18
To provide more programs	5	9
Growing interest of people in the arts	3	5
Increased staff	1	2
Decreased staff	1	2
Better promotion of the arts	1	2
Desire of agency to improve	1	2
Growth of community councils	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Restrictions and Mandates

The emphasis of an agency's programs will obviously be significantly affected if restrictions or prohibitions are placed upon the agency's activities, or if the agency is mandated to conduct specific programs. Directors were questioned about fiscal and program restrictions and mandates. In response to the questions on fiscal restrictions, directors of 8 agencies reported that the agencies are legally prohibited from receiving any operating revenues, such as earnings from sale of publications, posters, or other goods and services.

Table 32

LEGAL PROHIBITIONS AGAINST RECEIVING OPERATING REVENUES

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Legally prohibited from receiving operating revenues	8	15
Not prohibited from receiving operating revenues	42	76
Not sure	5	9

However, 44% of the agencies reported that there are other fiscal prohibitions under which they operate. The prohibitions that were mentioned in response to an open-end question ranged from general state regulations to specific restrictions.

Table 33
OTHER FISCAL PROHIBITIONS UNDER WHICH AGENCY OPERATES*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
All other fiscal prohibitions	24	44
General state regulations, e.g., bidding, etc.	4	7
Purchases/administrative expenses must be authorized by another agency	3	5
Budget restrictions/appropriation limitation	2	4
All contracts/expenditures must be authorized by state agencies	2	4
Legislature must authorize receipt of all funds	1	2
No advances to organizations, funds on reimbursement basis only	1	2
No deficit spending	1	2
No solicitation of funds	1	2
No entertainment expenditures	1	2
No participation in commercial projects	1	2
No state funds for newsletters	1	2
Annual budget restricts funds to one-year period	1	2
Staff cannot be paid from outside funds	1	2
Funds must be spent only in areas specified in appropriation	1	2
Revenue sharing restrictions cause decrease in state funds if federal funds increase	1	2
Legislative committee blocks federal funds requiring state commitment	1	2
Staff development must be authorized by legislature	1	2
General IRS regulations	1	2
Too numerous to list	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Observation:

It should be remembered that the list of other fiscal prohibitions was derived from an open-end question, and what some directors mentioned as a prohibition could also be prohibited in other states even though not mentioned in response to this question. For example, prohibitions against deficit spending, entertainment expenditures, etc. are widespread, but may not be thought of by directors in terms of "fiscal prohibitions." This is also true in the question concerning program restrictions discussed next.

Almost half the agencies report some type of restriction or prohibition on program activities, with grants to individual artists volunteered most frequently among types of such restrictions.

Table 34

RESTRICTIONS OR PROHIBITIONS CURRENTLY AFFECTING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
There are restrictions affecting activities	26	47
Against grants to individuals	12	22
Restrictions of federal guidelines (e.g., those of the NEA, HEW, etc.)	3	5
Grants made only to non-profit/tax-exempt organizations	3	5
Against publication of newsletter	2	4
No grants for capital expenditures	2	4
Limitation on number of staff	1	2
No purchasing of works of arts	1	2
No grants to other state agencies	1	2
No grants to schools or public universities	1	2
Recipients must not discriminate on basis of sex, race or religion	1	2
Against funding of deficits	1	2
Maximum amount per year to any one organization	1	2
Only funds earmarked for administration may by used for administration	1	2
Grants must require completion of activity for which made	1	2
Official discouragement of unproven or controversial programs	1	2
Printing must be done by state	1	2
Too much control by other state agencies	1	2
Local city or county tax money cannot be spent on the arts	1	2
No restrictions affecting activities	27	49
Not sure	2	4

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Although a number of agencies reported either fiscal or program restrictions, no single type of restriction was widely cited. Furthermore, some restrictions cited by agencies are probably not considered as restrictions generally, even though they may be so. For example, most state arts agencies are probably not in a position to grant funds to organizations unless they are non-profit and/or tax-exempt, and all work within some federal guidelines, but these were mentioned by only a minimal number of directors.

In those agencies where restrictions do affect programming, activities that cannot be funded directly sometimes receive assistance from the agencies through indirect channels. When asked whether they use subgranting to provide funds to individuals or organizations, 21 agencies reported the use of subgranting; 12 use subgranting to fund individuals or organizations they are prohibited from funding directly and 13 to make grants they prefer not to make directly (4 agencies subgrant for both reasons).

Table 35

WHETHER AGENCY USE ANY MEANS OF SUBGRANTING FUNDS TO INDIVIDUALS OR ORGANIZATIONS IT IS PROHIBITED FROM, OR PREFERS NOT TO, FUND DIRECTLY

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total agencies using subgranting	21	38
To individuals or organizations to whom direct grants are prohibited	12 [1]	22
To individuals or organizations agency prefers not to make grants to directly	13 [2]	24
No such use of subgranting	34	62

---

[1] 3 of these agencies are prohibited from making grants to individuals.

[2] 2 of these agencies are prohibited from making grants to individuals.

The means used focus on subgrants through qualified non-profit organizations, local arts councils, and an affiliated or independent foundation to individuals or non-qualifying organizations. Subgranting by preference is often done to insure better administrative and financial control and reporting of the project.

Another possible restriction on agencies is the setting of a maximum amount that may be granted for a single project. However, in only 15% of agencies is such a maximum imposed, and the amount permitted goes as high as $150,000.

Table 36

MAXIMUM AMOUNT THAT MAY BE GRANTED FOR SINGLE PROJECT

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
There is a maximum amount	8	15
$5,000-9,999	4	7
$10,000	1	2
$20,000	1	2
$55,000	1	2
$150,000	1	2
Median amount: $9,500		
No maximum amount	47	85

Observation:

Legal restrictions do not limit state arts agencies significantly, it seems. Even the funding of individual artists, which has been seen to be the major restriction, can sometimes be effected through an intermediary organization.

The reverse of legal restrictions -- i.e., legal requirements to conduct particular programs -- is even more uncommon. Only two agencies -- New York and Minnesota -- were required at the time of the survey to conduct programs in certain areas or arts types, and in both states at least a partial amount of funds it required to be distributed according to a geographical, population basis. (However, it should be remembered that by earmarking funds for specific programs or projects, legislatures can effectively achieve similar ends as that of mandating.)

When asked about legislative mandates to conduct specific activities or to serve particular groups, agencies mentioned the broad areas discussed in the analysis of legislation in Chapter II. However, ten directors do see trends or shifts in a direction towards mandated activities that can lead to less control of programs by the agency.

Table 37

WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE MANDATING BY LEGISLATURE TO CONDUCT SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES ARE FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	10	18
No trends or shifts	39	71
Not sure	6	11

Table 38

TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE MANDATING BY LEGISLATURE TO CONDUCT SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total agencies foreseeing trends or shifts	10	18
Specific activities/organizations to be funded	2	4
Population/geographic distribution	2	4
Distributions of funds to local arts councils	1	2
Aid to city government on revenue-sharing basis	1	2
More rural activities	1	2
Serving major professional companies and museums	1	2
Greater public participation in art forms	1	2
Direct appeals to legislature by special interests	1	2
New administration, not sure of direction	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Another way in which programs can be specified, in addition to legislative mandate, is through earmarked or restricted funds. The greater the proportion of such funds -- defined in the survey as "funds whose use is designated and over which the state arts agency has no discretionary granting power" -- the less the ability of the agency to determine its program directions. In a slight majority of states -- 29, or 53% -- at least some portion of the legislative appropriation for fiscal 1974 was earmarked or restricted, either for administrative purposes or for specific program activities or recipients, and in 15 of those states the entire appropriation was earmarked.

However, of the total state legislative appropriations of $30,756,494, only 7%, or $2,234,628, was earmarked or restricted, with the remaining 93%, or $28,521,866, being discretionary, unrestricted funds.

Table 39
DISTRIBUTION OF FISCAL 1974 LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

	Total Legislative Appropriation	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Alabama	125,000	-	-	125,000	100
Alaska	149,600	90,300	60	59,300	40
American Samoa	60,000	30,000	50	30,000	50
Arizona	68,700	68,700	100	-	-
Arkansas	166,727	16,727	10	150,000	90
California	1,034,763	-	-	1,034,763	100
Colorado	120,963	90,963	75	30,000	25
Connecticut	351,500	137,500	39	214,000	61
Delaware	42,600	30,600	72	12,000	28
District of Columbia	52,000	-	-	52,000	100
Florida	289,895	-	-	289,895	100
Georgia	220,000	55,000	25	165,000	75
Guam	10,218	10,218	100	-	-
Hawaii	221,307	115,000	52	106,307	48
Idaho	10,000	10,000	100	-	-
Illinois	600,000	-	-	600,000	100
Indiana	170,005	-	-	170,005	100
Iowa	52,244	31,869	61	20,375	39
Kansas	45,634	-	-	45,634	100
Kentucky	153,930	-	-	153,930	100
Louisiana	44,000	44,000	100	-	-
Maine	162,000	-	-	162,000	100
Maryland	453,411	129,411	29	324,000	71
Massachusetts	600,000	-	-	600,000	100
Michigan	485,800	125,000	26	360,800	74
Minnesota	300,000	-	-	300,000	100
Mississippi	107,668	-	-	107,668	100
Missouri	654,920	-	-	654,920	100
Montana	27,550	27,550	100	-	-
Nebraska	35,122	25,122	100	-	-
Nevada	15,122	15,122	100	-	-
New Hampshire	45,679	45,679	100	-	-
New Jersey	698,932	532,932	76	166,000	24
New Mexico	45,300	45,300	100	-	-

(continued)

Table 39
DISTRIBUTION OF FISCAL 1974 LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BY EARMARKED VS. FISCRETIONARY FUNDS
(continued)

	Total Legislative Appropriation	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
New York	16,445,000	-	-	16,445,000	100
North Carolina	221,231	71,231	32	150,000	68
North Dakota	5,100	5,100	100	-	-
Ohio	849,847	-	-	849,847	100
Oklahoma	95,100	-	-	95,100	100
Oregon	54,563	54,563	100	-	-
Pennsylvania	758,000	-	-	758,000	100
Puerto Rico	2,753,267	152,000	6	2,601,267	94
Rhode Island	126,231	-	-	126,231	100
South Carolina	360,896	-	-	360,896	100
South Dakota	61,702	-	-	61,702	100
Tennessee	312,500	-	-	312,500	100
Texas	157,345	157,345	100	-	-
Utah	104,026	-	-	104,026	100
Vermont	52,626	52,626	100	-	-
Virgin Islands	120,000	-	-	160,000	100
Virginia	201,702	-	-	201,705	100
Washington	98,415	-	-	98,415	100
West Virginia	263,580	-	-	263,580	100
Wisconsin	42,227	42,227	100	-	-
Wyoming	12,543	12,543	100	-	-
TOTAL	30,756,494	2,234,628	7	28,521,866	93

Observation:

Restricted funds are seemingly defined differently by different agencies. For example, appropriations for administrative purposes may be considered earmarked by some agencies and not be considered so by others. Any examination of restricted/earmarked funds should take this difference of evaluation into account.

Funds from other state sources, as well as from federal and municipal and county sources, can also be received for specific activities. However, the only other division by source between earmarked and discretionary funds determined here was made in funds received from private sources. Of the 31 states that received private funds (including earnings) in fiscal 1974, 21 or 67% had at least a portion of those funds earmarked, and in 15 of those states all private funds were earmarked. Overall, just under half of total private funds received were restricted. Of the total of $720,115 received from private sources by the 31 states, $347,119 (48%) was earmarked or restricted and $373,650 (52%) was discretionary or unrestricted.

Table 40
DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE FUNDS RECEIVED IN FISCAL 1974 BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY

	Total Private Funds Received	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Alabama	818	-	-	818	100
Alaska	70,153	70,153	100	-	-
Arizona	12,155	7,000	58	5,155	42
Arkansas	12,500	12,500	100	-	-
Connecticut	1,500	1,500	100	-	-
Delaware	2,402	2,055	86	347	14
Georgia	5,000	5,000	100	-	-
Guam	1,485	1,485	100	-	-
Hawaii	4,389	4,389	100	-	-
Idaho	2,175	2,175	100		
Indiana	137,356	-	-	137,356	100
Iowa	2,002	480	24	1,522	76
Maine	806	-	-	806	100
Maryland	6,150	6,150	100	-	-
Michigan	147,275	-	-	147,275	100
Minnesota	34,161	34,161	100	-	-
Nebraska	11,441	10,000	87	1,441	13
Nevada	1,191	1,191	100	-	-
New Mexico	2,000	2,000	100	-	-
North Carolina	2,500	2,500	100	-	-
Puerto Rico	47,400	-	-	47,400	100
Rhode Island	23,609	-	-	23,609	100

(continued)

Table 40
DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE FUNDS RECEIVED IN FISCAL 1974 BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY (cont'd)

	Total Private Funds Received	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
South Carolina	21,750	21,750	100	-	-
South Dakota	476	-	-	476	100
Tennessee	3,416	-	-	3,416	100
Texas	138,723	138,723	100	-	-
Utah	500	-	-	500	100
Vermont	2,030	-	-	2,030	100
Virgin Islands	15,500	14,500	94	1,000	6
Virginia	7,070	7,070	100	-	-
Wyoming	2,837	2,337	82	500	18
TOTAL	720,770	347,119	48	373,650	52

Looking at the distribution of earmarked vs. discretionary funds by the type of private sources from which funds were received, it is not unexpected to see that all corporate contributions to state arts agencies in fiscal 1974 were earmarked and almost all contributions from individuals, as well as a majority of funds received from foundations, were given for restricted purposes. However, it should be remembered that these represent only a minor part of funds received from state arts agencies; as noted in Chapter I, total private funds were only 2% of total funds received.

Table 41
SOURCES OF PRIVATE FUNDS RECEIVED IN FISCAL 1974, BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY

	Total Received	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Total private funds	720,770	347,119	50	348,651	50
Foundations	386,673	223,817	58	162,856	42
Individuals	92,312	90,195	98	2,117	2
Corporations	13,160	13,160	100	-	-
Other private	37,003	3,869	10	33,134	90
Earnings	191,622	16,078	8	175,544	92

The restriction or earmarking of funds was also studied from amother perspective, i.e., by expenditures. In this aspect of the analysis of earmarked funds, only program funds were considered. Although 25% or more of program expenditures were earmarked or restricted in 13 of the states, earmarked funds did not account for a significant proportion of total program expenditures in fiscal 1974. Of the total program funds from all sources of $37,491,082, only 8% or $3,104,083 was earmarked, with the remaining 92% or $34,386,999 being expended at the discretion of the agency.

Table 42
DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAM EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY

	Total Program Expenditures	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Alabama	259,859	-	-	259,859	100
Alaska	417,374	213,074	51	204,300	49
American Samoa	120,000	30,000	25	90,000	75
Arizona	242,785	87,630	36	155,155	64
Arkansas	441,282	154,358	35	286,924	65
California	1,013,748	37,748	4	976,000	96
Colorado	229,012	49,012	21	180,000	79
Connecticut	540,917	60,000	11	480,917	89
Delaware	213,903	51,903	24	162,000	76
District of Columbia	149,900	-	-	149,900	100
Florida	415,798	-	-	415,798	100
Georgia	373,617	58,617	16	315,000	84
Guam	77,256	11,703	15	65,553	85
Hawaii	720,973	193,038	27	527,935	73
Idaho	163,508	23,508	14	140,000	86
Illinois	733,335	-	-	733,335	100
Indiana	360,648	-	-	360,648	100
Iowa	248,444	73,744	30	174,700	70
Kansas	200,425	-	-	200,425	100
Kentucky	341,509	102,804	30	238,705	70

(continued)

Table 42
DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAM EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY (cont'd)

	Total Program Expenditures	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Louisiana	242,150	-	-	242,150	100
Maine	311,523	-	-	311,523	100
Maryland	633,837	214,852	34	418,985	66
Massachusetts	634,724	-	-	634,724	100
Michigan	856,362	125,000	15	731,362	85
Minnesota	591,483	40,567	7	550,916	93
Mississippi	225,630	-	-	225,630	100
Missouri	745,847	18,767	3	727,080	97
Montana	195,723	-	-	195,723	100
Nebraska	196,211	53,711	27	142,500	73
Nevada	152,837	18,161	12	134,676	88
New Hampshire	184,918	48,733	26	136,185	74
New Jersey	871,675	530,000	61	341,675	39
New Mexico	184,298	2,000	1	182,298	99
New York	15,146,010	-	-	15,146,010	100
North Carolina	373,817	73,817	20	300,000	80
North Dakota	173,000	-	-	173,000	100
Ohio	929,304	84,228	9	845,076	91
Oklahoma	141,385	-	-	141,385	100
Oregon	207,150	72,150	35	135,000	65
Pennsylvania	857,576	71,537	8	786,039	92
Puerto Rico	2,065,230	152,000	7	1,913,230	93

(continued)

Table 42
DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAM EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY (cont'd)

	Total Program Expenditures	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Rhode Island	372,425	10,000	3	362,425	97
South Carolina	491,912	147,769	30	344,143	70
South Dakota	204,133	-	-	204,133	100
Tennessee	393,446	-	-	393,446	100
Texas	664,795	128,965	19	535,830	81
Utah	208,916	-	-	208,916	100
Vermont	173,847	-	-	173,847	100
Virgin Islands	268,167	14,500	5	253,667	95
Virginia	353,542	53,542	15	300,000	85
Washington	339,992	-	-	339,992	100
West Virginia	505,120	72,700	14	432,420	86
Wisconsin	171,108	21,108	12	150,000	88
Wyoming	158,696	2,837	2	155,859	98
TOTAL	37,491,082	3,104,083	8	34,386,999	92

Observation:

Again it should be pointed out that differences exist among agencies in defining whether funds are earmarked or discretionary, particularly with regard to program grants from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Criteria for Funding or Denial of Funding

The criteria employed in decisions concerning the funding of projects are central in the determination of an agency's program emphases. In most agencies these criteria are codified to at least some extent; 89% of the agencies have some form of written general grants provisions and/or regulations governing the funding of projects, 75% have written program guidelines covering the funding of projects, 75% have written program guidelines covering the funding of specific types of projects, and 91% at least one of the two.

Table 43
WHETHER AGENCY HAS WRITTEN GRANT PROVISIONS OR PROGRAM GUIDELINES

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Agency has written general grant provisions and/or regulations governing funding of projects, and/or written program guidelines governing funding of specific types of projects	50	91
Agency has written provisions	49	89
Agency has written guidelines	41	75

Agencies that have guidelines distribute them primarily in response to requests and to mailing lists (40 of the 41 agencies do this). Other means employed include press releases, newsletters, personal contact and conferences and inclusion with grant applications.

Written grant provisions and guidelines can be of great assistance to potential recipients of funds, and it is unexpected that as many as one in four agencies do not have guidelines. Interestingly, the agencies with larger total expenditures, and consequently the greater likelihood of having to make more funding decisions, are no more likely to have written provisions or guidelines; in fact, agencies in the highest budget category are even somewhat less likely to have this material:

Table 44

EXISTENCE OF WRITTEN GRANT PROVISIONS OR PROGRAM GUIDELINES, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Has written general grant provisions	49	89	13	87	20	100	9	90	7	70
Has written program guidelines	41	75	13	87	14	70	8	80	6	60

Observation:

It should be noted that guidelines generally are directed towards means and methods of making applications for funds rather than being descriptive of an agency's program emphases.

To determine how decisions are made concerning the funding of projects, directors were given a list of seven items, with the opportunity provided for the adding of more items, and asked which are usually a part of the agency's decision-making process for funding projects. The formal application form or proposal letter and a staff review of applications are each a part of the decision-making process in more than nine in ten agencies, and in a majority of agencies there is a review and clearance by a council/commission subcommittee, a decision by the council/commission and/or a panel review.

Table 45
ITEMS THAT ARE USUALLY A PART OF THE AGENCY'S DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR FUNDING PROJECTS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Staff review of application, including budget	53	96
Formal application or proposal letter	51	93
Council/commission decision	49	89
Council/commission subcommittee review and clearance	34	62
Panel review and evaluation	33	60
On-site visit	22	40
Evaluation by other outside consultant(s)	15	27
Review by governor	2	4
Review by head of department of which agency is a part	1	2

Specific Criteria Used in Funding Decisions

Nineteen criteria that might enter into a project-funding decision were drawn up by the National Research Center of the Arts with the advice and counsel of consultants, and directors were asked to rate the importance of each on a scale of very important, somewhat important, of minor importance and not important at all. Later in the interview, they were asked which of the list were reasons for the denial of formal applications during fiscal

1974, and which two or three were responsible for the denial of the greatest number of formal applications. Not surprisingly, the availability of agency funds ranked highest in the number of directors rating it very important in funding decisions, followed by ability of the individual or group to accomplish the project and the quality of the project. The project's quality or lack thereof was top ranked as a reason that projects were denied in fiscal 1974, followed by the availability of funds and artistic quality of applicants. In contrast, the political implications of the project ranked last both in terms of importance and as a reason for denial of fiscal 1974 applications.

Table 46
CRITERIA INVOLVED IN DECISIONS ON THE FUNDING OF PROJECTS

	Ratings of "very important" in decisions of agency			Reasons for denial of any formal applications in fiscal 1974			Reasons for denial of greatest number of formal applications in fiscal 1974		
	#	%	(Rank)	#	%	(Rank)	#	%	(Rank)
Total	55	100		55	100		55	100	
Availability of agency funds	51	93	(1)	47	85	(2)	26	47	(2)
Ability of individual/group to accomplish project	50	91	(2)	39	71	(5)	13	24	(4)
Quality of project	49	89	(3)	49	89	(1)	35	64	(1)
Need for project	48	87	(4)	40	73	(4)	10	18	(6)
Integrity of person or persons connected with the project	41	75	(5)	32	58	(10)	2	4	(14)
Artistic quality of the individual or organization applying	39	71	(6)	44	80	(3)	18	33	(3)
Ability of recipients to raise matching funds	37	67	(7)	35	64	(8)	8	15	(7)
Tax-exempt status of the organization applying	36	65	(8)	29	53	(12)	8	15	(7)
Financial soundness of the individual or organization applying	33	60	(9)	36	65	(7)	2	4	(14)
Completeness and clarity of the application	28	51	(10)	30	55	(11)	4	7	(11)
Whether applicant and project fall within established guidelines	28	51	(10)	39	71	(5)	11	20	(5)
Extent of community support	28	51	(10)	28	51	(14)	4	7	(11)
Audiences aimed at in the project	26	47	(13)	20	36	(16)	3	5	(13)
How the project relates to basic program priorities of the agency	20	36	(14)	34	62	(9)	1	2	(16)
The professional or non-professional status of the individual or organization applying	20	36	(14)	22	40	(15)	6	11	(10)
Number of people to benefit from the project	18	33	(16)	29	53	(12)	7	13	(9)
Importance of grant in generating additional support for the project	14	25	(17)	16	29	(17)	1	2	(16)
Location of the project in the state	11	20	(18)	16	29	(17)	1	2	(16)
Political implications of the project	2	4	(19)	8	15	(19)	1	2	(16)
No formal applications for funding denied in fiscal 1974				2	4		2	4	

Table 46 indicates that funding decisions are largely based on quality of projects -- the highest ranked criterion among the two or three reasons for the denial of the greatest number of applications -- artistic quality of applicants, and ability of applicants to accomplish the project, in addition to the very basic availability of funds. Integrity of applicants is not a problem: although this criterion ranked fifth in ratings of very important, it was fourteenth among reasons for denial of the greatest number of applications.

Quantity in terms of number of audience members is relatively unimportant (ranked sixteenth in very important ratings and ninth among reasons for the denial of the greatest number of applications). Agency directors also do not see their funding role as primarily one of priming the pump to gain additional funds, with the generation of additional support ranked low in both areas; however, the ability of recipients to raise matching funds does rank in the upper half of the criteria.

Additional criteria volunteered by directors as important in the agency's decision centered on the making of arts accessible to the public and the development of new and innovative arts forms, while other reasons for denial of applications in fiscal 1974 were headed by the duplication of efforts.

Table 47

OTHER CRITERIA IMPORTANT IN DECIDING WHETHER A PROJECT SHOULD BE FUNDED*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Whether project makes arts of quality accessible	7	13
Ability of project to develop new, innovative art forms	7	13
Stability of organization	4	7
Ability of project to generate more funds in future	3	5
Services provided for schoolchildren	2	4
Approval by secretary of state	1	2
Non-duplication of services	1	2
Evidence of inter-agency cooperation	1	2

Table 48

OTHER REASONS IMPORTANT IN DENYING FORMAL APPLICATIONS FOR THE FUNDING OF PROJECTS IN FISCAL 1974*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Duplication of efforts, activities	4	7
Applicant not type of organization agency supports	2	4
Project not truly arts project	2	4
Failure to comply with guidelines	2	4
Lack of familiarity with project by council/commission members	3	5
Lateness of application	1	2
Date conflicts	1	2
Absence of good planning	1	2
Lack of innovation	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to open-end questions.

Matching Funds

Matching funds -- those funds raised by recipients of project expenditures to equal a percentage of the expenditure -- are required by approximately half the state arts agencies for all project grants, and by almost all agencies for a least some grants. In response to a question of matching funds, directors of only 2 agencies reported not requiring matching funds for any project grants.

Table 49

REQUIREMENTS FOR MATCHING FUNDS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Matching funds required for all project grants	27	49
Matching funds required for some project grants	26	47
Matching funds required for no project grants	2	4

When a match is required, it is likely that it must equal the grant; in two-thirds of the agencies asking for matching funds the required match is 100%. In the remaining agencies, the required match varies according to recipient, type of grants, etc.

Table 50

PERCENTAGE OF GRANT REQUIRED AS MATCHING FUNDS
(Base: Agencies that require matching funds for at least some projects)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies requiring matching funds	53	100
100% of project grant required	35	66
Matching requirement varies	18	34

Contributions from the private sector are naturally allowable as matching funds by all agencies, but strong majorities also accept as matching funds operating revenues, services or goods in kind, and/or grants from other government agencies.

Table 51
TYPES OF MATCHING FUNDS ALLOWED BY AGENCY
(Base: Agencies that require matching funds for at least some projects)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies requiring matching funds	53	100
Contributions from private sources	53	100
Operating revenues	47	89
Services or goods in kind	47	89
Grants from other government agencies	46	87

In 2 of the agencies, no formal applications for the funding of projects were denied during fiscal 1974; in contrast, in 5 agencies 70% or more of the applications received were denied funding.

Table 52
APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF FORMAL APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING
OF PROJECTS THAT WERE DENIED BY THE AGENCY IN FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
0%	2	4
1% - 9%	6	11
10% - 19%	5	9
20% - 29%	7	13
30% - 39%	6	11
40% - 49%	10	18
50% - 59%	10	18
60% - 69%	4	7
70% - 79%	5	9
Average percentage of applications denied	38%	

Observation:

Consultant directors indicate that agency guidelines and and pre-screening as well as discouragement of applications by the agency, are important factors in limiting the number of requests that even reach the formal application stage, so that the actual denial of requests for funda at all stages was substantially higher than the 38% indicated in the table.

Interestingly, larger budget agencies tend to deny a larger proportion of applications. However, the higher proportion of denials at the upper levels is a result primarily of agencies in which per capital expenditures were less than $.17; the average percentage of applications denied by agencies with higher per capita expenditure was equal to or less than the overall average in all expenditure levels.

Table 53
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF APPLICATIONS DENIED
IN FISCAL 1974 BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

		$250,000-$499,999			$500,000-$749,999			$750,000 and above		
	Total %	Total %	Less Than $.17 per Capita %	$.17 and Above %	Total %	Less Than $.17 per Capita %	$.17 and Above %	Total %	Less Than $.17 per Capita %	$.17 and Above %
Average percentage of applications denied	38	40	40	38	40	50	33	45	51	35

Non-Funding Programs

State arts agencies provide support to the arts and culture of their states in many other ways in addition to the funding of projects. When asked in an open-end question what they felt are the most important non-funding activities undertaken by the agencies, directors focused on consultation, technical assistance, public promotion and information services, and program development/administration, with a wide range of other activities also volunteered as important in addition to grant-making.

Table 54
MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY AGENCY IN ADDITION TO THE FUNDING OF PROJECTS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Consultation	24	44
Promoting public awareness of the arts	17	31
Technical assistance	16	29
Information/communications	15	27
Program development and administration	13	24
Promoting financial support of the arts from other sources, educating public/government to needs of the arts	12	22
Community council development and assistance	9	16
Conferences, seminars, workshops	8	15
Coordination of arts activities	5	9
Inter-agency cooperation	4	7
Providing cultural leadership	3	5
Publications	3	5
Development of coordinating/support organizations	2	4
Communication between artists and sponsors	2	4
Management assistance	2	4
Awards	2	4
Policy-making reference board	2	4
Regional training	1	2
Legislative budget	1	2
Construction of facilities for the arts	1	2
Identification of professional personnel	1	2
Judging of art exhibitions	1	2
Planning and hanging exhibitions	1	2
Lending art works	1	2
Educating arts community and applicants	1	2
Art Train	1	2
General community arts activities	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

A majority of agencies report that these non-funding activities are conducted in every art form, with other agencies mentioning a variety of specific art forms. Similarly, approximately half the agencies say that the non-funding activities are normally conducted for all types of groups, with specific types mentioned by others.

Table 55
ART FORMS IN WHICH NON-FUNDING ACTIVITIES ARE CONDUCTED*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
All art forms (no specific form cited)	31	56
Visual arts	12	22
Performing arts	9	16
Music	7	13
Theatre/drama	6	11
Dance	6	11
Art councils	5	9
Environmental arts	3	5
Literature	3	5
Crafts	3	5
Folk arts	2	4
Museums	2	4
Education	2	4
Architecture	1	2
Expansion arts	1	2
Mime	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to open-end questions.

Table 56
TYPES OF GROUPS FOR WHICH NON-FUNDING ACTIVITIES ARE NORMALLY CONDUCTED*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
All types (no specific type cited)	27	49
Community arts councils	19	35
Performing arts organizations	11	20
Individual artists	7	13
Schools	7	13
Museums	6	11
Arts organizations, non-specific	6	11
Individuals establishing arts councils or organizations	5	9
Visual arts groups	5	9
Theatre groups	3	5
Music organizations	4	5
Service organizations	2	4
Dance groups	2	4
Universities	1	2
Media	1	2
Ethnic groups	1	2
Opera	1	2
Arts and crafts organizations	1	2
Government agencies	1	2
Historical societies	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to open-end questions.

The non-funding activities account for a large portion of the man hours of state arts agencies. Although 5 agencies report that less than 20% of work time by the director and staff is devoted to such activities, 23 agencies estimate that more than half the time of the staff is spend in this work.

Table 57
PERCENTAGE OF WORK TIME BY DIRECTOR AND STAFF DEVOTED TO NON-FUNDING ACTIVITIES

	Total Agencies		Expenditures			
			Below $250,000	$250,000-499,999	$500,000-749,999	$750,000 and Over
	#	%	%	%	%	%
Total	55	100	100	100	100	100
Less than 20%	5	9	14	1	10	10
20% - 29%	8	15	25	10	10	10
30% - 39%	13	23	13	40	20	10
40% - 49%	6	11	7	5	10	30
50% - 59%	11	20	20	15	20	30
60% - 69%	8	15	7	20	20	10
70% - 79%	1	2	-	5	-	-
80% and above	3	5	14	-	10	-
Average percentage of work time devoted to non-funding activities		44%	43%	44%	48%	44%

Observation:

That 42% of the agencies devote more than half of their staff work time to non-funding activities reflects the importance given by the agencies to this "service" aspect of their work, especially since the average percentage of work time given to non-funding activity remains closely within the same range, regardless of the expenditure level of the agency.

Programs of Associated Foundations

As noted in Chapter I, 12 state arts agencies had separate foundations associated with them in fiscal 1974, with funds totaling $2,041,251 for the year. In fiscal 1975, 17 (31%) of the state arts agencies had a separate foundation associated with them, two of which were inactive. Various types of programs and activities are conducted through these foundations, with the foundations most widely used to raise funds. In a number of cases, though, they conduct activities either paralleling or extending the activities of the agency itself.

Table 58

ACTIVITIES OF ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATION*

(Base: Agencies that have associated separate foundation)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with associated foundation	17	100
Fund raising, receiver of gifts and donations	10	59
Grant making	4	24
Support services, general suppport	4	24
Aid to individual artists	2	12
Pay part of director's salary	1	6
Manage, direct artists in programs	1	6
Performing arts center	1	6
Governor's awards program	1	6
Artists-in-schools program	1	6
Technical assistance program	1	6
Touring program	1	6
Small loans to arts organizations	1	6
Entertainment fund	1	6
Administrative programs not handled by agency	1	6

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Approximately half of the agencies with associated foundations believe that trends or shifts will occur in the near future, primarily in the direction of increased activities and more responsibility for programming.

Table 59

WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATION ARE FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS

(Base: Agencies that have associated separate foundation)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with associated foundation	17	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	9	53
No trends or shifts	8	47

Table 60

TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATION FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*

(Base: Agencies that have associated separate foundation)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with associated foundation	17	100
Agencies that foresee trends or shifts	9	53
More active fund raising role	3	18
More touring activity	1	6
More special community projects	1	6
More activities in schools	1	6
Programs for individual artists	1	6
Programs funded that are not directly related with agency	1	6
Limited programming initiated	1	6
Foundation responsible for programs, agency for administration	1	6
Funds provided for specific programs of agency	1	6
Expect pressure on foundation from legislature	1	6

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Foundations are likely to be on the rise in number as well. Of the 38 agencies with no associated separate foundation as of fiscal 1975, 9 (or 24% of the 38) have plans for the establishment of such a foundation. And of the foundations in existence, 7 (or 41%) had been founded within the two years prior to the survey.

In the exploration of the program activities of associated separate foundations, all directors were asked in an open-end question what they believed to be the benefits of having such a foundation and the problems involved. The benefits volunteered by directors centered on the existence of fewer restrictions governing the foundation's activities, while problems mentioned most often concerned competition and confusion and relationships with state government.

Table 61
BENEFITS OF HAVING AN ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATION*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Fewer restrictions on use of funds	22	40
Ability to receive private, non-governmental funds	17	31
Fewer restrictions on execution or expansion of programs	15	27
Provide increased funds, better fund raising	12	22
Cuts red tape, increases flexibility	12	22
Involves more people, broadens support base	3	5
Less political pressure	3	5
Provides opportunity for public relations support	2	4
Functions as record keeper of funds spent	2	4
Involves influential businessmen	1	2
Allows increased federal funds	1	2
Funds may be invested to draw interest	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Table 62

PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN HAVING ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATION *

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Competes for funds with arts organizations	8	15
Reduces funding responsibility of legislature	7	13
Confusion in responsibilities of agency vs. foundation	7	13
Funds without state control disliked by state authorities	7	13
Administrative/logistical problems	4	7
Autonomous foundation would be inoperable	3	5
Funding problems	3	5
Might become too autonomous, operate outside guidelines	3	5
Could overshadow/dictate to agency	2	4
Communications difficulties with non-professional staff	2	4
Incorporation/legal/tax difficulties	1	2
Duplication of effort	1	2
Would no longer receive administrative services	1	2
Another board would mean more opinions to deal with	1	2
Greater administrative costs	1	2
Possibility of self-interest	1	2
Problems with public relations image of agency	1	2
Freedom and flexibility may cause suspicions	1	2

---

[*] Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Although fewer restrictions on the use of funds was the most cited benefit of having an associated separate foundation, more than half the funds received by the 12 active foundations in fiscal 1974 actually were earmarked. Surprisingly, only 6% of corporate contributions to associated foundations were earmarked (in comparison with 100% of corporate funds directly to the state arts agencies); in contrast, all of the funds from the state government, other than the state arts agency, were earmarked.

Table 63
SOURCES OF FUNDS RECEIVED BY ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATIONS IN FISCAL 1974, BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY

	Total Received	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Total funds received (12 agencies)	2,041,251	1,113,571	55	927,680	45
State arts agency	659,806	535,306	81	124,500	19
National Endowment for the Arts	526,450	458,150	87	68,300	13
Foundations	136,962	66,552	49	70,410	51
Individuals	55,074	11,649	21	43,425	79
Corporations	49,725	3,200	6	46,525	94
Other state	16,424	16,424	100	-	-
Other private	82,281	2,000	2	80,281	98
Earnings	500,772	8,890	2	491,882	98
Other	13,757	11,400	83	2,357	17

In two states with associated foundations -- Florida and Michigan -- all funds received by the foundation were discretionary, while in South Carolina all of the funds were earmarked, as were all but a very minimal amount of funds received by the foundation in New York.

Table 64
DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS RECEIVED BY ASSOCIATED SEPARATE FOUNDATIONS IN FISCAL 1974 BY EARMARKED VS. DISCRETIONARY

	Total Received	Earmarked or Restricted		Discretionary or Unrestricted	
	$	$	%	$	%
Colorado	93,993	92,993	99	1,000	1
Connecticut	530,275	46,300	9	483,975	91
Florida	7,238	-	-	7,238	100
Illinois	156,357	55,299	35	101,058	65
Indiana	49,825	1,000	2	48,825	98
Massachusetts	217,100	24,300	11	192,800	89
Michigan	85,969	-	-	85,969	100
Nebraska	23,667	23,000	97	667	3
New York	808,549	805,613	100	2,936	*
Oregon	19,562	16,900	86	2,662	14
South Carolina	48,166	48,166	100	-	-
Wyoming	550	-	-	550	100
TOTAL	2,041,251	1,113,571	55	927,680	45

---

*Less than 0.5%

CHAPTER IV

PROJECT EXPENDITURES

PROJECT EXPENDITURES

This chapter discusses the project expenditures including grants, contracts, etc. made by the agency in fiscal 1974. (In the definition used in the survey, "a project refers to a specific individual project usually within a program area, such as a specific dance company's tour in the state, the assignment of an advisor to provide technical assistance to a particular arts organization, the support of concerts by a particular symphony orchestra, the assignment of an artist to a school, etc.") The expenditures are analyzed in terms of four major areas. These are:

-- Sources of funds, the sources from which the funds for projects were derived, i.e., the amount of funds for expenditures received by the state arts agency from its legislative appropriations, from other state funds, from the National Endowment and other federal sources, and from local and private sources.

-- Recipients, the individuals or organizations to whom the expenditures were made. Two different groups of recipients were identified in the research: (1) the primary, or direct, recipients, those individuals or organizations who received the funds directly from the state arts agency, and (2) secondary, or indirect, recipients, the individuals or organizations to whom primary recipients distributed some part of the expenditures.

-- Art form, the art form for which the expenditure was made, such as music, dance, literature, visual arts, etc.

-- Type of activity assisted, the use for which expenditures were made, such as basic support, touring, research, etc. Two different levels of activities were identified: (1) the one primary activity, the main use for which the expenditure was made; and (2) secondary activities, other activities for which the expenditure was used in addition to the main use.

In addition to these four major areas, the project expenditures are also discussed in terms of:

-- How the project was initiated, i.e., whether the project was initiated by the grantee, the state arts agency, or a combination of the two.

-- The location of the project, in urban, suburban, or rural area.

-- The previous funding of the project, i.e.,whether the expenditure was made for an ongoing project, was one-time funding, or was for a pilot project.

As the final stage in the analysis of project expenditures, the funds generated by the expenditures as matching funds and the total costs of the projects are discussed.

Throughout the chapter the project expenditures are shown in total for all 55 state arts agencies; in most areas of analysis, the expenditures are also detailed for each arts agency individually. It was felt that such an agency-by-agency breakdown was the most significant one for project expenditures, and for this reason the analytic grouping of total expenditures used elsewhere in the report are referred to only where significant variations occur. (Because of the disproportionate amount of project expenditures made by the New York agency, it is not included in the analytic groupings in this chapter.)

In addition to the state-by-state breakdowns, the art forms and types of activity for which expenditures were made are also analyzed in terms of who received the expenditures and the sources from which the funds for these expenditures were derived.

Total Expenditures

The state arts agencies expended a total of $43,780,286 in fiscal 1974. Of this amount, $6,289,204 represented personnel and other administrative expenditures, with the remaining $37,491,082 expended for programs. Ninety-two percent* of these total program expenditures -- or $34,553,000 -- was actually distributed by the agencies in grants, contracts, etc. (This includes only funds expended by the agencies, and does not include recipients' matching funds nor funds from other sources.) The $34,553,000 was distributed by the agencies to 6,903 projects, or an average of $5,000 per project.

Project expenditures of the New York State Council on the Arts alone accounted for $15,113,000 during fiscal 1974, or 44% of the total project expenditures, with expenditures made for 996 projects in New York State. Removing New York from the calculation, the remaining 54 agencies expended $19,440,000 for a total of 5,907 projects, or an average of $3,000 per project.

---

*The remaining 8% of program expenditures was expended primarily in the area of program development and administration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 65
PROJECT EXPENDITURES AND NUMBER OF PROJECTS IN FISCAL 1974

	Dollars $	Number #
Alabama	267,000	154
Alaska	398,000	127
American Samoa	120,000	17
Arizona	229,000	62
Arkansas	415,000	79
California	938,000	151
Colorado	217,000	87
Connecticut	938,000*	259
Delaware	186,000	66
District of Columbia	139,000	21
Florida	421,000	73
Georgia	368,000	62
Guam	63,000	31
Hawaii	672,000	98
Idaho	164,000	58
Illinois	730,000	373
Indiana	385,000	94
Iowa	254,000	111
Kansas	209,000	67
Kentucky	342,000	88
Louisiana	124,000 1/	58
Maine	312,000	142
Maryland	510,000	150
Massachusetts	558,000	150
Michigan	715,000	414
Minnesota	439,000	162
Mississippi	209,000	119
Missouri	742,000	66
Montana	142,000	104
Nebraska	178,000	128
Nevada	134,000	53
New Hampshire	201,000	66
New Jersey	582,000	111
New Mexico	175,000	74
New York	15,113,000	996
North Carolina	364,000	100
North Dakota	169,000	66
Ohio	929,000	173
Oklahoma	140,000	148
Oregon	207,000	106
Pennsylvania	738,000	166
Puerto Rico	286,000	22
Rhode Island	316,000	91
South Carolina	528,000	185
South Dakota	165,000	96
Tennessee	398,000	182
Texas	617,000	91
Utah	205,000	49
Vermont	174,000	67
Virgin Islands	243,000	78
Virginia	295,000	86
Washington	359,000	96
West Virginia	506,000	108
Wisconsin	176,000	73
Wyoming	149,000	49
Total	$34,553,000	6,903

Average expenditure per project: $5,000

Total Without New York	$19,440,000	5,907

Average expenditure per project: $3,000

---

[*] Includes project expenditures made by the Connecticut Foundation for the Arts.

1/ Based on incomplete data.

Highlights of the Distribution of the Project Expenditures

The distribution of project expenditures described in this chapter refers to the dollar amounts of those expenditures rather than the number of projects, and the analysis of project expenditures will be primarily concerned with these dollar amounts, since they more accurately reflect the flow of financial support. For example, one agency might consider funds granted to a single recipient but covering several phases of a project as one project expenditure, while another agency could consider the same amount as constituting three project expenditures. It is true that the number of institutions or organizations in a state will determine to some extent the number of projects, while the size of the institutions within a particular field will determine to some extent the dollar amounts of the project expenditures, but the latter nevertheless provides a more realistic view of support from state arts agencies.

The performing arts accounted for the largest portion of the agencies' project expenditures in fiscal 1974. Twenty-seven percent of all expenditures was received directly by performing arts organizations, and performing arts organizations were among the secondary recipients of another 16% of project expenditures made directly to other recipients. Furthermore, in the distribution of the funds by art forms a full 50% of the expenditures was made in one or more of the performing arts, with music accounting for 23% of total projects expenditures, theatre for 12%, dance for 10%, and combinations of the three for another 5%.

The majority of the expenditures were not made for a specific project, but for the more general support of organizations or institutions. Twenty-nine percent of the funds went to program support of the organizations or institutions, 16% for staff salary support, and another 14% for basic operating support.

Significant amounts were directed to individual artists, although these funds were not likely to be granted directly to these individuals. Only 1% of project expenditures was made directly to individual artists, but professional artists were among the secondary recipients of 13% of project expenditures and non-professional artists among the secondary recipients of 2% of the expenditures. (Secondary recipients, however, may not receive the total amount of funds; they may share funds with the primary recipient, and there may also be a number of secondary recipients sharing the funds.) Agencies also reported that 12% of the expenditures was made for the direct support of individual artists for specific services and another 1% for direct support of individual artists in pursuit of their art.

A majority of the project expenditures made in fiscal 1974 represented continuing support of ongoing projects, with 67% being expended for such funding. Furthermore, an additional 6% represented first-time expenditures in planned ongoing funding.

The project expenditures of the agencies generated more than the total amount expended in matching funds, and the expenditures accounted for less than one-third of the total costs of projects supported, and for only 13% of the total operating budgets of those organizations and institutions which received basic support.

Sources of Funds for Project Expenditures

Approximately \$2.00 out of every \$3.00 (66%) of the \$34,553,000 in project expenditures in fiscal 1974 was derived from the state appropriations to the state arts agencies, with 29% coming from funds from the National Endowment for the Arts. As noted in the analysis of sources of total funds in Chapter I, however, the high proportion of funds from the state is strongly affected by New York State, where 99% of the total project expenditures of $15,113,000 came from the state appropriations. Without New York, state appropriations accounted for only 40% of project expenditures.

-- $22,709,000 (66%) came from state appropriations and another $471,000 (1%) from other state sources.

-- $10,088,000 (29%) was from National Endowment for the Arts funds: $7,638,000 (22%) from the basic state agency grants, $50,000 (less than 0.5%) from Treasury Fund grants, and $2,400,000 (7%) from other Endowment grants.

-- $296,000 (1%) from other federal funds.

-- $21,000 (less than 0.5%) from local governments.

-- $968,000 (2%) from private funds: $494,000 (1%) from foundations associated with the state arts agencies and $474,000 (1%) from other private sources.

The sources of funds for project expenditures naturally parallel the sources of the agencies' total funds. The proportion of project expenditures derived from state appropriations, as noted, ranges from 99% in New York State -- where state appropriations also constituted 99% of total funds received -- to 0% in Arizona, the District of Columbia, Guam, Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Wisconsin and Wyoming, states in which a relatively low percentage of total funds were received from state appropriations.

The basic state agency grant distributed by the National Endowment for the Arts to all states is a major source of funds for project expenditures; not including New York State, the basic state agency grant accounts for almost as large a proportion as the state appropriation (39% and 40%, respectively).

Table 66
SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Total Without New York	Alabama	Alaska	Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
	$	%																	
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$19,440	$267	$398	$120	$229	$415	$938	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
State																			
State appropriation	22,709	66	40	20	17	50	-	39	84	14	27	8	-	49	44	-	25	-	80
Other[1]	471	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-
Federal																			
National Endowment for the Arts:																			
Basic state agency grant	7,638	22	39	55	39	50	62	36	16	69	16	74	100	36	40	98	20	96	19
Treasury Fund grants	50	*	*	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2,400	7	12	23	29	-	28	17	-	17	12	16	-	14	15	-	4	11	1
Other federal[2]	296	1	2	2	2	-	5	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	2	-
Local Government	21	*	*	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private																			
Foundation associated with agency	494	1	3	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	43	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Other private	474	1	2	-	8	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	*	2	1	1	-

[1] Other state funds include funds for purchases of art for public buildings and places, $327,000; Governor's funds, $45,000; State Bicentennial Commission $29,000; Department of Economics and Community Development, $26,000; Department of Conservation, $20,000; Portrait Commission, $10,000; State Univesity, $8,000; and Education, $6,000.

[2] Other federal funds include Office of Education, $181,000; Department of Labor, $2,800; American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission, $97,000; National Parks' Service, $6,000; Bureau of Indian Affairs, $7,000; and the Smithsonian Instituion, $3,000.

(continued)

Table 66

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974 (Continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana 1/	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
	$	%																			
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%.	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
State																					
State appropriation	22,709	66	21	9	11	28	-	32	62	68	39	43	12	76	-	-	-	-	69	-	99
Other[1]	471	1	-	-	-	10	-	3	3	-	*	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal																					
National Endowment for the Arts:																					
Basic state agency grant	7,638	22	35	53	72	41	77	49	33	26	21	33	61	20	100	77	100	68	25	80	1
Treasury Fund grants	50	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2,400	7	7	35	17	20	23	16	2	6	32	11	26	3	-	8	-	32	5	20	-
Other federal[2]	296	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-
Local Government	21	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private																					
Foundation associated with agency	494	1	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other private	474	1	26	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	5	6	-	1	-	6	-	-	-	-	-

(Continued)

---

[1] Based on incomplete data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 66
SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974 (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
	$	%																				
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
State																						
State appropriation	22,709	66	40	4	75	4	2	81	52	28	36	13	54	9	26	*	38	42	1	48	-	-
Other[1/]	471	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal																						
National Endowment for the Arts:																						
Basic state agency grant	7,638	22	40	88	15	96	71	18	48	52	28	83	29	24	66	77	62	51	41	30	81	76
Treasury Fund grants	50	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
Other	2,400	7	20	6	9	-	25	1	-	6	22	-	9	18	8	21	-	7	45	19	19	24
Other federal[2/]	296	1	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	27	-	2	-	-	13	1	-	-
Local Government	21	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private																						
Foundation associated with agency	494	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other private	474	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	13	-	*	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Primary, or Direct, Recipients of Project Expenditures

The differences among states in the distribution of project expenditures to primary recipients are naturally a result of many factors, including legal restrictions or mandates, the earmarking of agency funds, council/commission policies, the ability of recipients to generate matching funds, the state's cultural resources, etc. These controlling factors should be remembered in the consideration of the distribution of project expenditures.

Performing arts organizations received the largest amount of funds expended by the state arts agencies in fiscal 1974, with more than $1.00 out of every $4.00 (27%) going to performing arts organizations. The state arts agencies themselves were the recipients of 12% of project expenditures, while museums received 10% of funds expended.

The amount of funds distributed to the primary recipients -- i.e., the organizations or individuals who received the funds directly from the agencies -- were:

Arts and cultural organizations

-- $9,197,000 (27%) went to performing arts organizations. Most of this amount, $7,949,000 (23% of total project expenditures), went to professional performing arts organizations, with only $1,248,000 (4%) to non-professional performing arts organizations.

-- $3,343,000 (10%) to museums, of which $1,651,000 (5%) went to art museums, $950,000 (3%) to general museums, $411,000 (1%) to science museums, and $331,000 (1%) to history museums.

-- $2,151,000 (6%) to cultural centers.

-- $1,755,000 (5%) to community or municipal arts councils.

-- $1,097,000 (3%) to foundations not associated with the state.

-- $1,063,000 (3%) to visual arts organizations other than museums.

-- $699,000 (2%) to foundations associated with state arts agencies.

-- $644,000 (2%) to regional organizations[1] and another $8,000 (less than 0.5% to other state arts agencies.

-- $497,000 (1%) to arts fairs or festivals.

-- $5,925,000 (17%) to other arts and cultural organizations, including such groups as performing arts presenters (concert associations, opera guilds, etc.), libraries, poetry societies, arts associations, etc.

Other organizations

-- $2,473,000 (7%) to educational institutions, of which $1,447,000 (4%) went to colleges and universities and $1,026,000 (3%) to schools or school systems.

-- $311,000 (1%) to civic groups.

-- $265,000 (1%) to public radio or public television stations.

Individuals

-- $285,000 (1%) to individuals, of which $271,000 (1%) went to artists and $14,000 (less than 0.5%) to non-artists.

---

[1] It should be pointed out that the term "regional organization," as used by states in reporting project expenditures, refers to organizations serving or representing a region within the state, as well as to regional organizations of state arts agencies. In the questionnaire, directors of state arts agencies reported a total of $104,812 contributed only to regional organizations of state arts agencies in fiscal 1974.

Other

- -- $4,137,000 (12%) to the state arts agencies for projects undertaken by themselves.
- -- $142,000 (less than 0.5%) to other state agencies within the state.
- -- $217,000 (1%) to a combination of recipients.
- -- $343,000 (1%) to miscellaneous other recipients.

Observation:

Museums, which are a larger industry nationally in dollar terms than the performing arts, are getting only approximately a third of the project expenditures from the state arts agencies that the performing arts organizations receive. However, it should be remembered that in many parts of the country museums are governmental or quasi-governmental institutions

In Museums USA it was found that 1 in 3 museums (34%) are government run: 6% of museums are federal museums, 12% are state museums and 16% municipal or county museums. Being under government control, these museums are naturally more likely to receive funds through government channels other than the state arts agency than are the performing arts organizations.

Primary Recipients by State

The proportional distribution of the primary recipients of project expenditures differed sharply among individual states. Professional performing arts organizations, which received 23% of total project expenditures, were not primary recipients of any project money in Alabama, Alaska and North Dakota or in American Samoa and Puerto Rico. In contrast, a majority of project expenditures went to professional performing arts organizations in

Missouri (84%), Maryland (63%), Utah (59%), the District of Columbia (55%), and Pennsylvania (51%). Non-professional performing arts organizations were recipients of a majority of project expenditures in North Dakota (52%).

The proportion of funds received by museums also varied significantly by state, with the 10% of funds received by museums overall rising to 16% in Massachusetts, and 19% in Tennessee where a unique museum program is underway; even more importantly, 17% of project expenditures in New York State -- whose project expenditures totaled $15,113,000 -- went to museums (7% to art museums, 5% to general museums, 3% to science museums, and 2% to history museums).

Sharp variations were also seen in the proportion of funds to cultural centers -- the overall average of 6% rising to a plurality (39%) of project expenditures in Arkansas; to community councils -- recipients of a plurality of funds in both West Virginia (29%) and Georgia (34%), in comparison with 5% of project expenditures overall; and to colleges and universities -- recipients of 4% of project expenditures overall but higher pluralities in Nevada (25%), Idaho (32%), and Nebraska (42%).

The widest differences in distribution of project expenditures, however, occurred in the proportion of expenditures received by the state arts agency itself. The state arts agency was not a recipient of project expenditures in 11 states (Alabama, California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Virgin Islands). In contrast, a majority of project expenditures went to the state arts agency for its own projects in Arizona (51%), Hawaii (51%), Iowa (51%), Vermont (59%), Louisiana (62%), South Carolina (66%), Alaska (67%), Puerto Rico (68%), and Texas (73%).

The differences in the proportion of expenditures that is made to the agency itself is dependent upon the degree of agency-administered programs. Many state arts agencies undoubtedly see it necessary to undertake projects that are not otherwise being done privately or for which no other qualified organization exists. Thus, the state agencies may conduct their own touring programs or present arts events under their own auspices. For example, state arts agencies in such states as Alaska and Puerto Rice administer most of the projects in those states. Furthermore, such programs as artists-in-schools are generally run by the agency.

Observation:

The existence or non-existence of cultural resources within a state -- such as the lack of professional performing arts organizations, or science museums, or local councils -- will obviously be reflected in the distribution of project expenditures. This is reflected, for example, in the higher than average proportion of expenditures to non-professional performing arts organizations in North Dakota, where professional recipients are limited or non-existent.

It is such diversities among states that is more likely to affect the distribution of project expenditures than such common qualities as size of total operating budget. Thus although a higher than average 10% of expenditures of agencies in the lowest budget category of below $250,000 went to non-professional performing arts groups -- a result of the fact that those agencies are generally located in states with fewer professional resources -- in all budget size groups performing arts organizations (including professional and non-professional) received a greater proportion of expenditures than any other type of recipient except the state arts agency itself.

Table 67

PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
	$	%																
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$267	$398	$120	$229	$415	$9[illegible]8	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Arts and Cultural Organizations																		
Professional performing arts organizations	7,949	23	-	-	-	6	16	20	10	18	16	55	31	17	30	23	24	19
Non-professional performing arts organizations	1,248	4	12	7	-	4	10	16	8	4	10	-	3	*	14	4	3	6
Art museums	1,651	5	2	-	25	*	-	6	2	3	4	-	3	-	-	*	2	4
General museums	950	3	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	*	-	4
Science museums	411	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
History museums	331	1	*	-	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	3	1
Cultural centers	2,151	6	-	-	-	3	39	7	5	19	13	11	1	-	2	-	-	5
Community or municipal arts councils	1,755	5	12	9	-	3	2	9	6	5	3	-	7	34	-	3	5	4
Foundations not associated with state arts agencies	1,097	3	-	-	-	-	*	3	1	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
Visual arts organizations other than museums	1,063	3	2	2	-	1	*	9	*	1	2	20	*	-	-	1	1	3
Foundations associated with state arts agencies	699	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
Regional organizations	644	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	*	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Arts fairs and festivals	497	1	-	1	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	19
Other state arts agencies	8	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other arts and cultural organizations	5,925	17	23	2	-	4	3	11	2	8	3	14	3	13	-	7	9	20
Other Organizations																		
Colleges and universities	1,447	4	24	6	-	7	1	3	2	6	7	-	23	3	-	5	32	7
Schools and school systems	1,026	3	18	2	-	-	-	6	2	1	8	*	*	4	-	-	8	3
Civic groups	311	1	2	-	-	5	1	2	1	3	-	-	-	3	-	*	3	1
Public radio or public television stations	265	1	-	1	-	-	1	6	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	2

(Continued)

---

* Less than 0.5%

1/ Louisiana project expenditures are incomplete.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 67

PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$267	$398	$120	$229	$415	$938	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Individuals																		
Professional artists	234	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	10	-	-	*	19	1	2	*
Non-professional artists	37	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-artists	14	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*
Others																		
Own state arts agency	4,137	12	-	67	42	51	25	-	38	26	17	-	24	17	32	51	*	-
Other state agencies within state	142	*	4	-	33	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	3	-	1	1	*
Combination of recipients	217	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	*
Other	343	1	1	1	-	*	1	*	7	1	*	-	-	5	1	4	1	1

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 67
PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
		100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100
Arts and Cultural Organizations																					
Professional performing arts organizations	7,949	23	15	7	36	7	20	19	63	21	9	28	11	84	7	3	13	29	49	26	24
Non-professional performing arts organizations	1,248	4	1	3	4	14	2	*	6	6	2	5	15	4	8	2	15	5	3	7	*
Art museums	1,651	5	4	2	10	2	-	5	8	6	4	13	4	*	2	1	5	*	*	3	7
General museums	950	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	4	*	*	*	-	1	*	-	-	1	1	5
Science museums	411	1	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
History museums	331	1	3	*	-	-	-	1	-	6	*	-	-	-	1	*	-	2	-	-	2
Cultural centers	2,151	6	-	*	1	-	-	1	1	4	2	2	-	-	7	1	*	5	4	-	9
Community or municipal arts councils	1,755	5	8	10	15	10	3	11	1	1	7	2	6	*	9	6	4	2	8	3	3
Foundations not associated with state arts agencies	1,097	3	2	*	-	-	-	*	-	1	*	*	-	*	2	*	-	3	-	-	6
Visual arts organizations other than museums	1,063	3	-	-	2	4	3	5	*	3	1	*	10	*	1	1	3	4	*	1	4
Foundations associated with state arts agencies	699	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Regional organizations	644	2	1	1	-	2	*	-	-	-	*	12	12	5	*	-	-	9	-	3	3
Arts fairs and festivals	497	1	*	-	-	1	1	1	*	*	1	*	2	*	5	-	-	19	*	-	1
Other state arts agencies	8	*	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other arts and cultural organizations	5,925	17	4	5	14	6	4	6	4	7	44	3	3	5	12	28	22	3	5	19	25
Other Organizations																					
Colleges and universities	1,447	4	7	13	5	12	4	5	6	9	12	8	18	1	28	42	25	7	1	6	1
Schools and school systems	1,026	3	20	*	8	1	-	22	1	3	9	13	*	*	2	11	1	-	2	-	1
Civic groups	311	1	*	*	*	2	-	1	1	1	*	3	*	-	2	2	*	1	-	5	1
Public radio or public television stations	265	1	2	2	1	-	-	-	*	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	1

(Continued)

Table 67
PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
	$	%																			
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Individuals																					
Professional artists	234	1	-	1	-	6	-	-	-	1	2	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-professional artists	37	*	-	1	-	*	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-artists	14	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Others																					
Own state arts agency	4,137	12	6	51	-	27	62	15	8	-	6	2	15	1	12	-	8	-	23	22	-
Other state agencies within state	142	*	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	2	-	*	1	-	*	1	3	-
Combination of recipients	217	1	26	-	-	-	*	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	343	1	1	1	4	3	-	2	1	3	1	*	2	*	1	2	4	1	3	1	1

(Continued)

1/Based on incomplete data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 67

PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	North Caro-lina	North Dakota	Ohio	Okla-homa	Oregon	Penn-syl-vania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Caro-lina	South Dakota	Ten-nessee	Texas	Utah	Ver-mont	Virgin Islands	Vir-ginia	Wash-ington	West Vir-ginia	Wis-consin	Wyom-ing
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Arts and Cultural Organizations																						
Professional performing arts organizations	7,949	23	17	-	38	6	14	51	-	18	1	23	8	7	59	12	1	19	9	8	17	1
Non-professional performing arts organizations	1,248	4	2	52	7	18	*	1	22	6	4	3	2	4	1	3	18	17	4	1	14	10
Art museums	1,651	5	4	-	12	1	*	1	1	4	5	4	-	4	2	2	-	4	2	-	1	-
General museums	950	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	1
Science museums	411	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-
History museums	331	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
Cultural centers	2,151	6	2	4	3	5	1	2	-	*	*	*	-	2	-	5	3	5	-	3	1	1
Community or municipal arts councils	1,755	5	18	4	7	19	-	4	-	-	6	9	3	2	-	4	11	10	2	29	2	1
Foundations not associated with state arts agencies	1,097	3	-	-	*	2	1	3	-	-	1	6	5	-	1	*	-	-	-	8	*	7
Visual arts organizations other than museums	1,063	3	5	17	2	1	15	4	-	*	*	2	2	1	5	*	-	*	1	7	*	18
Foundations associated with state arts agencies	699	2	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional organizations	644	2	1	-	1	-	1	*	-	-	-	*	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-
Arts fairs and festivals	497	1	2	*	1	1	3	19	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-
Other state arts agencies	8	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other arts and cultural organizations	5,925	17	2	7	5	5	7	5	2	9	2	6	5	2	10	3	11	24	7	21	11	28
Other Organizations																						
Colleges and universities	1,447	4	3	6	3	19	13	6	3	2	2	20	4	4	1	4	5	3	1	2	21	13
Schools and school systems	1,026	3	1	-	2	4	4	*	4	*	3	*	11	*	8	1	29	5	23	1	3	1
Civic groups	311	1	1	5	1	6	2	1	-	*	1	-	*	1	*	-	6	-	*	3	*	2
Public radio or public television stations	265	1	1	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	1	*	-	*	-

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 67
PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
	$	%																				
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Individuals																						
Professional artists	234	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	11	2	2	1	-	-	6	1	-	-	-	4	1
Non-professional artists	37	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	1	10	-	-	-	1	-
Non-artists	14	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	1	-
Others																						
Own state arts agency	4,137	12	39	4	16	4	28	-	68	26	66	24	36	73	13	59	-	9	49	10	21	14
Other state agencies within state	142	*	-	-	2	*	1	-	-	-	2	-	*	-	-	*	5	*	*	-	-	-
Combination of recipients	217	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	3	-
Other	343	1	-	1	*	3	3	2	-	1	1	1	1	*	-	-	*	*	1	-	-	*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is important to note that, as mentioned previously, project expenditures of the New York State Council on the Arts accounted for 44% of total project expenditures of the 55 agencies. The distribution of project expenditures by the New York State Council naturally affects the overall distribution to a large degree, yet removing New York State from the total does not change the distribution of primary recipients significantly. The exceptions are that the proportion received by museums drops from 10% of the expenditures of all 55 agencies to only 4% of the project expenditures of the 54 excluding New York, while the proportion going to the state arts agency itself rises from 12% to 21%.

Table 68
PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY ALL STATES EXCEPT NEW YORK
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Total Without New York	
	$	%	$	%
Total project expenditures	34,553	100	19,439	100
Arts and cultural organizations				
Professional performing arts organizations	7,949	23	4,380	23
Non-professional performing arts organizations	1,248	4	1,233	6
Art museums	1,651	5	663	3
General museums	950	3	85	*
Science museums	411	1	1	*
History museums	331	1	191	1
Cultural centers	2,151	6	729	4
Community or municipal arts councils	1,755	5	1,247	6
Foundations not associated with state arts agencies	1,097	3	196	1
Visual arts organizations other than museums	1,063	3	504	3
Foundations associated with state arts agencies	699	2	207	1
Regional organizations	644	2	239	1
Arts fairs and festivals	497	1	413	2
Other state arts agencies	8	*	8	*
Other arts and cultural organizations	5,925	17	1,729	9
Other organizations				
Colleges and universities	1,447	4	1,345	7
Schools and school systems	1,026	3	842	4
Civic groups	311	1	225	1
Public ratio or public television stations	265	1	143	1
Individuals				
Professional artists	234	1	234	1
Non-professional artists	37	*	37	*
Non-artists	14	*	14	*
Others				
Own state arts agency	4,137	12	4,137	21
Other state agencies within state	142	*	142	1
Combination of recipients	217	1	217	1
Other	343	1	238	1

---

* Less than 0.5%

Sources of Funds for Expenditures to Primary, or Direct, Recipients

The distribution of project expenditures among the different types of recipients was not greatly affected by the sources of the funds for those expenditures, with a few exceptions.

Federal funds used for project expenditures were much more likely to be directed to the state arts agency itself than were state funds. Only 5% of the total state funds of $23,181,000 used for project expenditures went to the state arts agency, compared with 24% of the funds for project expenditures derived from the National Endowment for the Arts (a total of $10,088,000) and 92% of the funds derived from other federal sources (a total of $295,000). A large portion of the project expenditures to the state arts agencies themselves derived from the Endowment are accounted for by grants for artists-in-schools programs that are administered by the agencies.

Coleges and universities also accounted for a higher proportion of Endowment funds (9%) than of state funds (2%). In contrast, the proportion of state funds directed toward museums was higher than that of federal funds, with 13% of state funds used for project expenditures going to museums compared with 3% of Endowment funds. This difference, however, is a direct result of the previously noted higher proportion of New York State project expenditures made to museums.

Table 69

PRIMARY, OR DIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		State	Federal					
					National Endowment For the Arts				
	$	%	State	Total	Total	Basic State Agency Grant	Other 1/ Grants	Other Federal	Other 2/
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$23,181	$10,383	$10,088	$7,638	$2,450	$295	$989
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Arts and Cultural Organizations									
Professional performing arts organizations	7,949	23	27	17	17	21	3	-	18
Non-professional performing arts organizations	1,248	4	2	7	7	10	1	-	5
Art museums	1,651	5	6	2	2	3	1	-	3
General museums	950	3	4	*	*	*	-	-	1
Science museums	411	1	2	*	*	*	-	-	-
History museums	331	1	1	1	1	1	*	-	*
Cultural centers	2,151	6	8	3	3	3	*	-	1
Community or municipal arts councils	1,755	5	4	7	7	8	3	-	3
Foundations not associated with state arts agencies	1,097	3	4	1	1	1	*	-	*
Visual arts organizations other than museums	1,063	3	3	3	3	4	*	-	1
Foundations associated with state arts agencies	700	2	2	1	1	1	2	-	*
Regional organizations	644	2	2	3	3	3	2	-	*
Arts fairs and festivals	497	1	2	1	1	1	2	-	-
Other state arts agencies	8	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	*
Other arts and cultural organizations	5,925	17	21	10	10	11	9	2	9
Other Organizations									
Colleges and universities	1,447	4	2	9	9	10	5	2	3
Schools and school systems	1,026	3	2	6	6	4	12	4	3
Civic groups	311	1	1	1	1	2	*	-	3
Public radio or public television stations	265	1	1	*	*	*	1	-	*
Individuals									
Professional artists	234	1	*	1	1	1	1	-	5
Non-professional artists	37	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*
Non-artists	14	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	*
Other									
Own state arts agency	4,137	12	5	24	24	12	58	92	34
Other state agencies within state	142	*	*	1	1	1	*	-	*
Combination of recipients	217	1	*	1	1	1	*	-	10
Other	343	1	1	1	1	2	*	-	1

1/ Includes Endowment Treasury Fund grants and other grants.
2/ Includes local government grants and private funds.
* Less than 0.5%.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Secondary, or Indirect Recipients

Portions of funds that are granted directly to some types of recipients may ultimately find their way to important secondary recipients; often there are one or more such secondary recipients of project expenditures in addition to the primary recipients already described. For example, an expenditure to a concert series may ultimately be channeled to a performing arts group presented by that association, or a grant to a college may be channeled to an individual to serve as an artist-in-residence.

In considering the proportions of expenditures received by secondary recipients, it should be kept in mind that they are likely to be receiving only a portion of the funds in question, with the expenditures possibly shared with the primary recipient and/or other secondary recipients.

Not surprisingly, individual artists did figure much more prominently as secondary recipients of fiscal 1974 project expenditures than as primary recipients. Although among primary recipients professional artists accounted for only 1% of project expenditures and non-professional artists for less than 0.5%, professional artists were among the secondary recipients of 13% of project expenditures and non-professional artists among the secondary recipients of 2% of the expenditures.

Project expenditures made directly to the state arts agencies themselves and to schools and to colleges are the most likely to be channeled to individual artists as secondary recipients (looking only at direct primary recipients that received at least $1,000,000 project expenditures):

-- Individual artists were among the secondary recipients of 35% of the expenditures to the state arts agencies themselves, 22% of expenditures to schools and school

> systems, and 20% of expenditures to colleges and universities. As will be seen later in this chapter, one-quarter of the project expenditures made to the state arts agencies were for artists-in-school projects, accounting for the relatively high proportion of individual artists and schools as secondary recipients.

Performing arts organizations were also among secondary recipients of a significant part of the project expenditures, with professional performing arts organizations among secondary recipients of 13% and non-professional performing organizations of 3% of project expenditures. Professional performing arts organizations were among secondary recipients of at least $1.00 in every $5.00 that went directly to non-associated foundations, cultural centers, colleges and miscellaneous other arts organizations:

-- Professional performing arts organizations were among the the secondary recipients of 49% of expenditures to foundations not associated with state arts agencies, 38% of expenditures to cultural centers, 33% of expenditures to colleges and universities, and 22% of expenditures to miscellaneous other arts and cultural organizations.

Colleges and universities and schools and school systems were also more likely than average to be secondary recipients of expenditures to the state arts agency itself, with schools being among the secondary recipients of 27% and colleges and universities among the secondary recipients of 14% of such expenditures.

Observation:

The very high 49% of expenditures directly to non-associated foundations that went to professional performing arts organizations as secondary recipients reflects to some extent the large number of such foundations, particularly in New York State, established to obtain support for dance companies, as will be seen also in the discussion of the distribution of expenditures by art form.

Table 70
SECONDARY, OR INDIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY PRIMARY RECIPIENTS[1]
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Primary Recipients										
	$	%	Professional Performing Arts Organizations	"Other" Arts and Cultural Organizations	Own State Arts Agency	Cultural Centers	Community or Municipal Arts Councils	Art Museums	Colleges and Universities	Non-Professional Performing Arts Organizations	Foundations Not Associated with State Arts Agencies	Visual Arts Organizations	Schools and School Systems
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$7,949	$5,924	$4,137	$2,151	$1,755	$1,651	$1,447	$1,248	$1,097	$1,063	$1,026
Secondary Recipients:			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Arts and Cultural Organizations													
Professional performing arts organizations	4,592	13	2	22	14	38	13	2	33	3	49	*	14
Non-professional performing arts organizations	1,102	3	*	3	9	1	6	1	12	1	1	-	5
Art museums	325	1	*	*	2	*	4	3	2	-	1	2	-
General museums	119	*	-	1	1	-	*	1	*	-	-	2	-
Science museums	201	1	-	-	1	*	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
History museums	193	1	-	*	4	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	-
Cultural centers	253	1	*	*	4	*	1	-	*	*	-	1	*
Community or municipal arts councils	875	3	5	1	6	1	1	1	1	2	2	-	*
Foundations not associated with state arts agencies	44	*	-	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	1	*	*
Visual arts organizations other than museums	332	1	*	1	3	*	2	1	2	-	1	3	*
Foundations associated with state arts agencies	52	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional organizations	59	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	1	-	*	*
Arts fairs and festivals	817	2	1	2	4	2	6	1	8	1	*	2	1
Other state arts agencies	99	*	-	1	*	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other arts and cultural organizations	1,292	4	1	7	7	-	3	1	3	2	3	3	1
Other Organizations													
Colleges and universities	1,485	4	6	1	14	*	2	1	2	2	*	4	3
Schools and school systems	1,941	6	3	1	27	1	5	*	7	6	2	4	*
Civic groups	373	1	1	*	1	*	2	1	1	1	2	4	*
Public radio or public television stations	54	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	1	-	-	-	

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

---

[1] Only primary recipients that received at least $1,000,000 in project expenditures are shown.

Table 70

SECONDARY, OR INDIRECT, RECIPIENTS OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY PRIMARY RECIPIENTS[1] (Continued)

	Total Agencies		Primary Recipients										
			Professional Performing Arts Organizations	"Other" Arts and Cultural Organizations	Own State Arts Agency	Cultural Centers	Community or Municipal Arts Councils	Art Museums	Colleges and Universities	Non-Professional Performing Arts Organizations	Foundations Not Associated with State Arts Agencies	Visual Arts Organizations	Schools and School Systems
	$	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Individuals													
Professional artists	4,620	13	9	18	35	4	11	4	20	10	7	9	22
Non-professional artists	573	2	1	1	3	*	3	*	6	4	*	2	*
Professional non-artists	647	2	1	1	6	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	*
Non-professional non-artists	205	1	1	1	1	*	1	*	1	1	*	1	*
Other													
Own state arts agency	79	*	-	-	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	2
Other state agencies within state	115	*	-	*	1	*	-	1	*	*	-	*	3
Combination of recipients	992	3	1	1	6	4	1	-	1	3	3	-	4
Other	137	*	*	1	2	*	*	*	*	*	1	-	*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Distribution of Project Expenditures by Art Form

The dominance of the performing arts in project expenditures of the state arts agencies -- which was indicated in the top ranking of performing arts organizations among recipients -- is clearly seen when the expenditures are analyzed in terms of the specific art forms in which they were made. The performing arts accounted for half of the project expenditures in fiscal 1974, with 23% of expenditures made in music, 12% in theatre, 10% in dance and 5% in a combination of performing arts forms.

The amounts of the project expenditures made for each art form were:

-- $7,771,000 (23%) in music, with 13% in orchestral, chamber music, etc., 4% in opera, 1% in jazz, folk or ethnic, 1% in choral, less than 0.5% each in rock, popular and in other types of music, and 4% in combinations of forms within music.

-- $4,195,000 (12%) in theatre, with 12% in plays and musicals and less than 0.5% in other forms of theatre.

-- $3,547,000 (10%) in dance, with 3% in modern dance, 2% in ballet, less than 0.5% each in ethnic, folk, in mime, pantomime, and in other forms of dance, and 4% in combinations of forms within dance.

-- $1,741,000 (5%) in combinations of the performing arts.

-- $4,909,000 (14%) in the visual arts, with 1% each in painting, drawing, graphics, in crafts, and in sculpture, less than 0.5% in photography, 1% in other visual arts, and 10% in combinations of the visual arts.

- $1,673,000 (5%) in public media, with 2% each in film and in television, and less than 0.5% each in video, in radio, in other forms of public media and in combinations of forms within public media.
- $1,097,000 (3%) in literature, with 1% in poetry, less than 0.5% each in playwriting, in fiction, in translations and in other forms of literature, and 2% in combinations of forms of literature.
- $962,000 (3%) in architecture and environmental arts.
- $291,000 (1%) in folk arts.
- $184,000 (1%) in multi-media.
- less than 0.5% in other art forms.
- $6,042,000 (17%) in combinations of art forms.
- $1,745,000 (5%) in the non-arts humanities field.

It should be remembered, however, that the dollar amounts expended are governed to a certain extent by financial needs; e.g., a visual arts or literature project may not cost as much as a musical project, museums may have more readily available support elsewhere, etc. Another important factor is the amount of funds requested in each art form. As will be seen later, the large majority of project expenditures is made for projects initiated by the grantee who has requested the funds. The distribution of requests, therefore, will significantly affect the distribution by art form, as well as by recipient. Furthermore, the factors previously mentioned will also significantly affect the distribution by art form, such as restrictions or mandates, earmarking, the state's cultural resources, etc.

Observation:

Many project expenditures were made for a combination of art forms, with 5% of expenditures being spent for a combination of performing arts forms and 17% for a combination of art forms generally. It is impossible to determine at this level exactly which art forms are involved in these combinations. In the former instance, for example, a state arts agency may make a grant to a local civic concert organization to support the performances of a number of different types, such as theatre performances, ballet performances, musical recitals, etc. In the latter instance, a grant may be made to a community council, for example, whose programs encompass a wide range of performing and visual arts.

Distribution by Art Form by State

When the distribution of project expenditures by art form is viewed state by state, sharp differences are again apparent, with the emphasis on some art forms varying widely among individual states.

-- Music, in which a plurality of 23% of total project expenditures was made, accounted for only 8% of expenditures in Texas, 7% in Tennessee and 4% in Puerto Rico. In contrast, a majority of the expenditures were made in music in Missouri (77%), Pennsylvania (57%), Guam (52%) and Maryland (51%), and half (50%) of the expenditures in New Jersey.

-- Theatre, in which 12% of total pro'ect expenditures was made, accounted for more than one-quarter of the expenditures in Kansas (30%), North Dakota (33%), and South Dakota (29%), a plurality of the expenditures in each of those states.

-- Similarly, more than one-quarter of project expenditures were in dance -- which accounted for 10% of expenditures overall -- in Louisiana (a plurality of 28%, based on incomplete information), Virgin Islands (28%) and Wisconsin (a plurality of 43%).

-- Visual arts, in which 14% of total project expenditures was made, accounted for more than one-third of expenditures in American Samoa (35%), pluralities of 36% in Puerto Rico, 37% in Tennessee and 39% in Wyoming, and 50% in Oregon expenditures, and a majority of 57% in Hawaii.

-- More than 10% of expenditures was made in public media -- which accounted for 5% of expenditures overall -- in New Hampshire (12%) and South Carolina (13%).

-- More than 10% of expenditures was made in literature -- which accounted for 3% overall -- in Delaware (11%), Utah (11%), Arizona (12%), North Carolina (12%), South Carolina (19%) and Wyoming (a much higher than average 22%).

Table 71

DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974,[1] BY STATE

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$267	$398	$120	$229	$415	$938	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Music	7,771	23	30	28	47	10	24	24	11	14	23	17	38	14	52	12	15	16
Orchestral, chamber, etc.	4,326	13	21	2	10	9	21	10	8	7	5	9	30	11	28	11	11	9
Opera	1,213	4	2	19	-	1	3	6	2	2	6	-	6	-	-	*	2	4
Jazz, folk, ethnic	402	1	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	2	*	-	-	1	*
Choral	217	1	1	-	35	-	-	2	*	*	-	-	*	2	6	*	*	1
Rock, popular	12	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	139	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-
Combinations within music	1,462	4	1	5	2	*	*	6	*	2	10	8	*	1	9	*	1	1
Theatre	4,195	12	14	5	1	10	5	15	2	17	15	24	14	11	3	7	20	12
Plays, musicals	4,074	12	14	5	1	10	5	15	2	17	15	24	14	11	3	7	20	12
Other	121	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dance	3,547	10	7	10	-	9	2	10	5	11	12	21	7	14	3	9	20	9
Modern	1,069	3	2	5	-	*	-	1	4	7	-	1	-	1	3	5	-	1
Ballet	852	2	1	*	-	1	1	4	1	2	-	-	-	8	-	3	10	3
Ethnic, folk	77	*	-	1	-	-	-	1	*	*	-	7	-	-	-	*	1	*
Mime, pantomime	34	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Other	143	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Combinations within dance	1,372	4	4	4	-	7	*	4	*	1	12	13	7	5	-	1	9	4
Combination of Performing Arts	1,741	5	4	5	-	2	2	3	10	3	1	-	8	*	-	4	10	17
Visual Arts	4,909	14	11	14	35	18	4	12	9	9	23	23	6	29	26	57	13	14
Painting, drawing, graphics	484	1	1	*	28	1	-	2	1	2	8	-	3	2	-	*	2	1
Crafts	417	1	1	1	3	*	*	*	-	1	-	-	*	8	17	1	1	*
Sculpture	177	1	*	-	-	10	-	*	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	1
Photography	141	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	2	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	1	*
Other	245	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within visual arts	3,445	10	8	12	4	7	4	10	6	4	14	23	3	17	9	55	9	11
Public Media	1,673	5	2	8	3	-	1	4	2	*	2	-	*	-	5	2	6	10
Film	803	2	2	7	3	-	-	-	2	*	*	-	*	-	-	1	6	5
Television	686	2	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	1
Video	68	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	2	-	-	-	-	*	-	4
Radio	18	*	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Other	9	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within public media	89	*	-	*	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	*

(Continued)

---

[1] Because of the large number of components of less than 0.5%, percentages may add to less than 100%, and with type of art form to less than total.

* Less than 0.5%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 71

DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974,[1] BY STATE (Cont'd)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
	$	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Literature	1,097	3	*	8	-	12	1	4	1	2	11	-	7	3	-	*	5	1
Poetry	469	1	*	4	-	5	1	3	1	2	5	-	7	3	-	*	5	*
Playwriting	8	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Fiction	7	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Translations	3	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	6	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within literature	605	2	-	4	-	6	-	1	-	*	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Other Art Forms	1,833	5	*	*	7	6	*	6	3	1	*	-	9	3	7	7	1	4
Architecture and environmental arts	962	3	-	-	-	-	-	5	2	1	*	-	1	2	1	*	-	2
Folk arts	291	1	-	-	7	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	7	1	2
Multi-media	184	1	-	*	-	3	*	*	*	*	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	*
Other	396	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations of Art Forms	6,042	17	31	20	7	33	60	22	48	43	12	15	11	26	4	2	8	16
Non-Arts Humanities Field	1,745	5	*	2	-	-	-	*	9	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	2	1

Table 71
DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974,[1] BY STATE (Cont'd)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana[1]	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Music	7,771	23	14	18	13	21	13	17	51	16	12	23	17	77	23	24	32	22	50	25	20
Orchestral, chamber, etc.	4,326	13	12	10	10	9	1	15	46	10	10	14	7	73	11	14	14	18	32	17	8
Opera	1,213	4	*	1	-	2	1	1	3	3	1	3	3	1	1	3	7	-	13	6	4
Jazz, folk, ethnic	402	1	*	1	3	1	2	*	*	1	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	1	*	-	1
Choral	217	1	1	-	-	4	*	*	1	1	*	1	1	*	-	2	6	1	2	-	*
Rock, popular	12	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*
Other	139	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Combinations within music	1,462	4	1	6	*	5	9	-	1	1	1	5	4	2	10	4	4	2	2	2	5
Theatre	4,195	12	7	10	30	12	7	6	19	12	11	15	10	13	18	15	8	11	5	13	12
Plays, musicals	4,074	12	7	10	30	12	7	6	19	12	11	14	10	13	18	15	8	11	5	13	11
Other	121	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1
Dance	3,54	10	8	6	9	4	28	7	7	6	12	21	4	7	5	16	4	7	7	3	11
Modern	1,069	3	4	-	*	-	-	4	3	2	6	18	1	-	3	4	-	-	-	-	4
Ballet	852	2	3	3	3	*	12	2	3	3	5	*	3	*	-	5	4	4	2	*	1
Ethnic, folk	77	*	-	1	1	-	1	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*
Mime, pantomime	34	*	*	1	*	-	-	1	-	1	*	*	*	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-
Other	143	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Combinations within dance	1,372	4	1	1	5	4	15	-	1	-	1	3	-	6	1	6	-	3	5	1	4
Combination of Performing Arts	1,741	5	28	11	3	20	5	7	3	2	1	4	7	2	*	1	20	6	2	1	6
Visual Arts	4,909	14	5	8	21	15	25	18	11	13	12	10	27	1	19	12	28	10	8	22	12
Painting, drawing, graphics	484	1	1	3	14	2	-	5	1	5	1	1	1	*	3	3	3	-	*	2	*
Crafts	417		*	*	6	4	-	3	*	1	1	*	6	*		2	-	4	1	4	*
Sculpture	177	1	-	*	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	*	*	1	-	*
Photography	141	*	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	*	1	*	*	1	*	-	-	1	1	1
Other	245	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	1	1	2
Combinations within visual arts	3,445	10	4	5	1	8	22	9	9	7	7	6	19	1	13	7	25	6	5	15	9 9
Public Media	1,673	5	4	4	5	2	2	-	*	3	2	1	7	*	4	1	-	12	3	3	8
Film	803	2	-	2	4	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	*	3	1	-	9	1	3	3
Television	686	2	3	2	1	*	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	4
Video	68	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	2	-	-
Radio	18	*	1	-	-	-	1	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	9	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within public media	89	*	-	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	*

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 71
DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974,[1/] BY STATE (Cont'd)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Ken-tucky	Loui-siana	Maine	Mary-land	Massa-chu-setts	Mich-igan	Minne-sota	Mis-sis-sippi	Mis-souri	Mon-tana	Ne-braska	Nevada	New Hamp-shire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
	$	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Literature	1,097	3	*	2	5	2	1	-	3	2	3	3	9	*	3	2	*	*	4	2	2
Poetry	469	1	-	2	3	1	*	-	*	*	*	2	7	*	-	2	*	*	1	-	*
Playwriting	8	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Fiction	7	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Translations	3	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Other	6	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within literature	605	2	*	-	2	1	*	-	3	1	3	1	1	-	3	*	*	-	3	2	2
Other Art Forms	1,833	5	2	2	-	*	-	*	4	2	2	9	6	*	1	28	3	13	*	2	7
Architecture and environmental arts	962	3	2	1	-	*	-	*	-	2	*	8	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	*	4
Folk arts	291	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	4	*	1	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	*	1
Multi-media	184	1	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	1	*	*	-	-	28	3	11	*	2	-
Other	396	*	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Combinations of Art Forms	6,042	17	30	39	14	24	19	37	2	32	41	14	13	*	26	*	4	17	20	28	12
Non-Arts Humanities Field	1,745	5	2	-	-	-	*	7	-	12	4	*	-	-	-	*	-	2	-	1	10

(Continued)

[1/] Based on incomplete data.

Table 71
DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974,[1] BY STATE (Cont'd)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total Project Expenditures	34,553	100	$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Music	7,771	23	12	28	31	27	15	57	4	11	10	18	7	8	27	16	39	33	11	31	19	10
Orchestral, chamber, etc.	4,326	13	3	21	26	20	12	37	-	5	2	7	3	4	22	10	8	29	7	15	12	4
Opera	1,213	4	1	4	3	*	2	1	-	2	*	-	1	4	2	1	*	2	2	4	4	-
Jazz, folk, ethnic	402	1	4	2	1	4	-	*	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	5	-	*	*	*	-
Choral	217	1	*	*	-	1	-	1	-	2	*	1	*	-	1	*	3	1	-	1	1	-
Rock, popular	12	*	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	139	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	1	-
Combinations within music	1,462	4	4	-	1	1	*	18	4	2	4	9	1	*	2	5	19	1	1	11	1	6
Theatre	4,195	12	7	33	20	21	10	7	12	11	11	29	3	7	20	5	6	24	4	10	13	5
Plays, musicals	4,074	12	7	33	20	21	10	7	12	11	11	28	3	7	20	5	4	24	4	10	13	5
Other	121	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Dance	3,547	10	16	2	8	6	5	16	13	8	10	7	7	12	24	1	28	12	16	6	43	7
Modern	1,069	3	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	4	1	3	1	-	-	*	-	10	-
Ballet	852	2	1	1	4	6	1	12	11	1	3	2	*	4	21	*	10	6	-	-	7	1
Ethnic, folk	77	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	*	-	1	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Mime, pantomime	34	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Other	143	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within dance	1,372	4	15	*	3	*	3	2	2	5	6	2	3	7	-	-	17	6	15	6	23	6
Combinations of Performing Arts	1,741	5	2	-	2	1	3	*	23	1	3	1	1	2	-	6	-	9	3	*	6	-
Visual Arts	4,909	14	11	21	19	12	50	6	36	7	22	13	37	11	17	10	4	9	12	15	4	39
Painting, drawing, graphics	484	1	1	2	2	3	1	-	23	*	3	1	6	1	5	3	2	1	1	*	2	-
Crafts	417	1	1	4	1	3	1	2	-	-	*	-	26	-	*	*	1	5	*	*	*	*
Sculpture	177	1	-	-	1	-	1	*	-	*	5	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	*	-	-
Photography	141	*	*	-	-	1	*	-	-	1	*	*	*	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	*
Other	245	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within visual arts	3,445	10	9	15	15	5	47	4	13	6	13	11	5	10	11	3	1	3	10	14	2	38
Public Media	1,673	5	5	-	1	4	1	1	-	3	13	1	2	3	-	1	2	2	3	3	7	-
Film	803	2	2	-	1	2	1	1	-	*	9	1	1	3	-	1	2	1	3	3	5	-
Television	686	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	*	-	-	-
Video	68	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Radio	18	*	1	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Other	9	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within public media	89	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 71

DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974,[1/] BY STATE (Cont'd)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	North Carolina %	North Dakota %	Ohio %	Oklahoma %	Oregon %	Pennsylvania %	Puerto Rico %	Rhode Island %	South Carolina %	South Dakota %	Tennessee %	Texas %	Utah %	Vermont %	Virgin Islands %	Virginia %	Washington %	West Virginia %	Wisconsin %	Wyoming %
Literature	1,098	3	12	2	2	1	10	1	*	1	19	-	4	3	11	3	1	3	9	6	*	22
Poetry	469	1	6	2	2	*	8	1	-	1	7	-	4	3	*	2	*	3	9	6	-	21
Playwriting	8	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fiction	7	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Translations	3	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	6	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within literature	605	2	6	-	*	*	2	-	*	-	12	-	*	*	11	1	-	*	-	-	*	*
Other Art Forms	1,833	5	-	7	4	*	5	*	4	2	9	4	5	21	1	-	3	-	*	-	2	*
Architecture and environmental arts	962	3	-	*	4	-	*	*	-	1	*	*	5	21	1	-	2	-	-	-	*	*
Folk arts	291	1	-	-	-	*	1	*	4	-	1	*	*	-	-	-	1	-	*	-	2	-
Multi-media	184	1	-	7	-	-	*	*	-	1	8	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	396	*	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations of Art Forms	6,042	17	35	5	13	28	1	11	1	56	2	27	34	33	*	58	17	7	42	29	6	16
Non-Arts Humanities Field	1,745	5	-	2	*	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1

As with the distribution of expenditures by recipient, the diversity among states in the proportion of expenditures in the various art forms seems a result of circumstances in the individual states rather than a reflection of some common attribute. Looking at the distribution by art form by the total budgets of the agencies, for example, shows little change from budget size to budget size, except for a slightly higher percentage of expenditures in the visual arts in the smallest budget group, and a higher percentage in music in the highest group.

Table 72

DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974
BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies	Expenditures			
		Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and above*
(Number of agencies)	(55)	(15)	(20)	(10)	(9)
Total Project Expenditures	$34,553	$2,293	$5,501	$5,313	$6,333
	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100	100	100
Music	23	23	19	22	32
Theatre	12	13	11	12	12
Dance	10	12	10	10	10
Visual arts	14	20	14	14	17
Public media	5	3	2	3	3
Literature	3	4	4	6	2
Combinations of performing arts	5	4	6	3	5
Combinations of art forms	18	16	31	23	15
Other art forms	10	5	3	7	4

---

*Without New York State

The project expenditures of the New York State Council on the Arts did not differ greatly in fiscal 1974 from the distribution by art form of all 55 agencies in total, so that removing New York from the calculations does not significantly change the overall distribution. For no single art form did the total without New York differ by more than three percentage points from the total of all 55 state arts agencies.

Table 73
DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL AGENCIES AND BY TOTAL AGENCIES WITHOUT NEW YORK
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Total Without New York	
	$	%	$	%
Total Project Expenditures	34,553	100	19,440	100
Music	7,771	23	4,789	25
Orchestral, chamber, etc.	4,326	13	3,176	16
Opera	1,213	4	561	3
Jazz, folk, ethnic	402	1	178	1
Choral	217	1	185	1
Rock, popular	12	*	9	*
Other	139	*	18	*
Combinations within music	1,462	4	662	3
Theatre	4,195	12	2,314	12
Plays, musicals	4,074	12	2,301	12
Other	121	*	13	*
Dance	3,547	10	1,937	10
Modern	1,069	3	422	2
Ballet	852	2	633	3
Ethnic, folk	77	*	46	*
Mime, pantomime	34	*	34	*
Other	142	*	12	*
Combinations within dance	1,372	4	790	4
Combinations of Performing Arts	1,741	5	890	5
Visual Arts	4,909	[illegible]	3,055	16
Painting, drawing, graphics	484	1	426	2
Crafts	417	1	342	2
Sculpture	177	1	137	1
Photography	141	*	38	*
Other	245	1	8	*
Combinations within visual arts	3,445	10	2,104	11
Public Media	1,673	5	537	3
Film	803	2	318	2
Television	686	2	73	*
Video	68	*	68	*
Radio	18	*	18	*
Other	9	*	9	*
Combinations within public media	89	*	51	*
Literature	1,097	3	723	4
Poetry	469	1	441	2
Playwriting	8	*	7	*
Fiction	7	*	4	*
Translations	3	*	-	-
Other	6	*	6	*
Combinations within literature	605	2	265	1
Other Art Forms	1,833	5	728	4
Architecture and environmental arts	962	3	344	2
Folk arts	291	1	151	1
Multi-media	184	1	184	1
Other	396	*	49	*
Combinations of Art Forms	6,042	17	4,265	22
Non-Arts Humanities Field	1,745	5	202	1

Distribution by Art Form of the Recipients

The art forms in which project expenditures were made naturally vary by the recipients of the expenditures. Not unexpectedly, for example, 85% of project expenditures to art museums in fiscal 1974 was in the visual arts and 94% of the expenditures to visual arts organizations other than museums. Correspondingly, 99% of expenditures made to professional performing arts organizations and of expenditures to nonprofessional performing arts organizations was in the performing arts.

Some interesting patterns do appear, however, in looking at the distribution of art forms by those primary recipients that received at least $1,000,000 in project expenditures. Expenditures made to the state arts agency itself focused on the visual arts (23%), with a lower than average 5% in music and 4% in theatre. A relatively high 36% of expenditures to the state arts agency itself was in a combination of art forms. Similarly, half (50%) of project expenditures to local councils assisted a combination of art forms, i.e., the funds were for the support of a number of art forms.

One of the sharpest divergences from the overall distribution of project expenditures by art forms was seen in the foundations not associated with arts agencies. A majority (59%) of expenditures to these foundations was in dance,* which accounted for only 10% of total project expenditures.

---

*As noted earlier, many dance companies have formed foundations associated with them as a means of obtaining financial support, and thus in those cases the project expenditure may be made to the foundation rather than to the performing arts organization itself.

Table 74

DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY PRIMARY RECIPIENTS

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Primary Recipients										
	$	%	Professional Performing Arts Organizations	"Other" Arts and Cultural Organizations	Own State Arts Agency	Cultural Centers	Community or Municipal Arts Councils	Art Museums	Colleges and Universities	Non-Professional Performing Arts Organizations	Foundations Not Associated with State Arts Agencies	Visual Arts Organizations	Schools and School Systems
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$7,950	$5,92	$4,137	$2,151	$1,755	$1,651	$1,447	$1,248	$1,097	$1,063	$1,026
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Music	7,771	23	52	20	5	22	9	*	26	40	7	*	18
Orchestral, chamber, etc.	4,325	13	37	9	1	1	5	*	15	24	2	*	4
Opera	1,213	4	9	1	2	12	*	–	2	7	*	*	*
Jazz, folk, ethnic	402	1	2	1	1	*	1	–	3	1	–	–	1
Choral	218	1	1	1	*	–	*	*	1	4	*	–	1
Rock, popular	12	*	*	*	–	–	*	–	*	*	*	–	*
Other	139	*	1	1	–	–	–	–	*	*	*	–	*
Combinations within music	1,462	4	2	7	2	9	2	*	5	3	5	–	11
Theatre	4,195	12	31	6	4	5	4	*	17	34	7	*	8
Plays, musicals	4,074	12	31	5	4	5	3	*	17	34	6	*	8
Others	121	*	*	1	–	*	1	–	*	*	1	–	*
Dance	3,547	10	14	5	10	15	4	1	13	22	59	–	14
Modern	1,069	3	5	*	2	*	1	1	5	2	32	–	9
Ballet	852	2	5	1	*	1	1	–	2	13	14	–	1
Ethnic, folk	77	*	*	*	–	*	*	–	1	1	*	–	*
Mime, pantomime	34	*	*	*	*	*	*	–	*	*	*	–	1
Other	143	*	*	2	–	–	–	–	*	1	–	–	*
Combinations within dance	1,372	4	4	1	8	13	2	–	5	4	12	–	3
Combinations of Performing Arts	1,741	5	2	7	3	14	6	–	10	3	1	–	3
Visual Arts	4,909	14	*	6	23	7	15	85	12	*	5	94	15
Painting, drawing, graphics	484	1	–	*	2	1	1	7	2	–	*	10	2
Crafts	417	1	–	1	3	*	3	*	1	–	*	10	1
Sculpture	177	1	–	*	1	*	1	*	*	–	*	1	4
Photography	141	*	–	*	*	*	*	1	*	–	*	6	*
Other	245	1	–	1	–	–	2	9	*	–	–	*	–
Combinations within visual arts	3,445	10	*	3	17	6	8	68	8	*	4	67	8
Public Media	1,673	5	*	12	3	8	2	3	5	–	10	2	4
Film	803	2	*	6	3	5	1	1	3	–	1	2	3
Television	686	2	–	6	–	3	–	1	1	–	7	–	–
Video	68	*	–	*	*	*	–	*	*	–	–	*	*
Radio	18	*	–	*	–	–	–	–	*	–	–	–	–
Other	9	*	–	–	–	–	–	–	*	–	–	–	–
Combinations within public media	89	*	–	*	*	*	1	1	*	–	2	–	1

(continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 74
DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY PRIMARY RECIPIENTS (continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Primary Recipients										
			Professional Performing Arts Organizations	"Other" Arts and Cultural Organizations	Own State Arts Agency	Cultural Centers	Community or Municipal Arts Councils	Art Museums	Colleges and Universities	Non-Professional Performing Arts Organizations	Foundations Not Associated with State Arts Agencies	Visual Arts Organizations	Schools and School Systems
	$	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Literature	1,097	3	*	7	10	1	1	-	3	-	2	-	7
Poetry	469	1	*	1	6	*	1	-	1	-	2	-	6
Playwriting	8	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fiction	7	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*
Translations	3	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	6	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combinations within literature	604	2	-	6	4	*	*	-	1	-	*	-	1
Other Art Forms	1,833	5	*	8	5	1	3	5	4	*	5	1	9
Architecture and environmental arts	962	2	-	5	3	*	*	2	*	-	5	1	6
Folk arts	291	1	-	1	1	*	*	3	*	-	*	-	1
Multi-media	184	1	*	*	*	1	1	*	3	*	-	*	2
Other	396	1	-	2	1	-	2	-	1	-	*	-	-
Combinations of Art Forms	6,042	18	1	24	36	25	50	5	9	1	4	3	21
Non-Arts Humanities Field	1,745	5	-	5	1	2	6	*	1	-	*	-	1

Sources of Funds for Expenditures in Art Forms

The distribution of project expenditures among the various art forms differed only slightly by the sources of the funds for those expenditures. Of the relatively small amount of funds ($295,000) derived from federal sources other than the National Endowment for the Arts, a higher than average 25% was in literature, all of it in poetry.* Similarly, of the $989,000 derived from local government grants and private funds, a higher than average 14% went into architecture and the environmental arts.

Otherwise, however, there was no pattern evident in the distribution of funds by source among the art forms.

---

*As noted in Chapter I, a large proportion of funds from federal sources other than the National Endowment for the Arts was accounted for by Office of Education grants made through the St. Paul Council on the Arts for the poetry program.

Table 75

DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		State	Federal					Other²/
				Total	National Endowment For the Arts			Other Federal	
					Total	Basic State Agency Grant	Other¹/ Grants		
	$	%							
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$23,181	$10,383	$10,088	$7,638	$2,450	$295	$989
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Music	7,771	23	25	21	21	25	7	2	14
Orchestral, chamber, etc.	4,326	13	13	12	13	16	2	-	6
Opera	1,213	4	4	3	3	3	2	-	5
Jazz, folk, ethnic	402	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
Choral	217	1	1	1	1	1	*	-	1
Rock, popular	12	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*
Other	139	*	1	*	*	*	-	-	-
Combinations within music	1,462	4	5	3	3	4	1	-	1
Theatre	4,195	12	12	12	12	14	5	-	10
Plays, musicals	4,074	12	12	12	12	14	5	-	10
Other	121	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-
Dance	3,547	10	9	12	12	9	22	-	11
Modern	1,069	3	3	2	3	1	7	-	6
Ballet	852	2	2	3	3	4	2	-	3
Ethnic, folk	77	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-
Mime, pantomime	34	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*
Other	143	*	1	*	*	*	-	-	-
Combinations within dance	1,372	4	3	5	6	3	13	-	2
Combinations of Performing Arts	1,741	5	5	4	4	5	3	-	12
Visual Arts	4,909	14	14	14	14	15	12	-	11
Painting, drawing, graphics	484	1	1	2	2	2	1	-	2
Crafts	417	1	1	1	1	2	1	-	1
Sculpture	177	1	*	1	1	1	1	-	2
Photography	141	*	1	*	*	*	*	-	*
Other	245	1	1	*	*	*	*	-	*
Combinations within visual arts	3,445	10	10	9	10	10	9	-	5
Public Media	1,673	5	6	3	3	3	5	-	1
Film	803	2	2	2	2	2	5	-	1
Television	686	2	3	*	*	*	-	-	*
Video	68	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*
Radio	18	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-
Other	9	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-
Combinations within public media	89	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*

(continued)

NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER OF THE ARTS, INC.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 75

DISTRIBUTION BY ART FORM OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS (continued)

(Dollar amounts in Thousands)

	Total Agencies		State	Federal					Other[2]
					National Endowment For the Arts				
				Total	Total	Basic State Agency Grant	Other Grants[1]	Other Federal	
	$	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Literature	1,097	3	2	4	4	2	9	25	8
Poetry	469	1	1	3	2	1	7	25	2
Playwriting	8	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-
Fiction	7	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	-
Translations	3	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	6	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	*
Combinations within literature	604	2	1	1	1	1	2	-	6
Other Art Forms	1,833	5	6	4	4	6	2	1	14
Architecture and environmental arts	962	3	3	2	2	3	1	-	14
Folk arts	291	1	1	1	1	1	*	-	-
Multi-media	184	1	*	1	1	2	*	1	*
Other	396	*	2	*	*	*	1	-	-
Combinations of Art Forms	6,042	18	14	25	25	20	34	73	18
Non-Arts Humanities Field	1,745	5	7	1	1	1	1	-	1

1/ Includes Endowment Treasury Fund grants and other grants.
2/ Includes local government grants and private funds.
* Less than 0.5%.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Types of Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures

In addition to determining the recipients of project expenditures and the art forms in which the expenditures were made, the survey asked the agencies to specify the activities assisted by the expenditures, i.e., the use to which the funds were put. The types of activity were spelled out to the agencies in a list of 29 activities drawn up in cooperation with the consultant directors and other experts.

Approximately $3.00 in every $10.00 of project expenditures in fiscal 1974 was primarily made for the program support of an institution or organization, by far the largest amount for a single type of activity. Another $1.60 of each $10.00 went for staff salary support, $1.40 for basic or general operating support of an institution or organization, and $1.20 for direct support of individual artists for specific services. The amounts of project expenditures by the primary activity for which they were made were:

-- $10,120,000 (29%) for program support of institution or organization.

-- $5,571,000 (16%) for staff salary support.

-- $4,876,000 (14%) for basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization.

-- $4,294,000 (12%) for direct support of individual artists for specific services, such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.

-- $2,330,000 (7%) for touring, with $1,532,000 (4%) for in-state touring, $703,000 (2%) for touring from out of state into the state, and $95,000 (less than 0.5%) from within the state to out of state.

-- $1,743,000 (5%) to artists-in-schools projects.

-- $902,000 (3%) to artists-in-residence projects.

-- $754,000 (2%) to miscellaneous education projects (scholarships, fellowships, lectures, courses, etc.).

-- 1% each for informational publications, conferences and other information sources ($478,000), commission by organization of visual arts creations ($437,000), commission by organization of performing arts creations ($312,000), conservation and preservation ($310,000), audience development ($304,000), improvement of the visual environment ($281,000), community or neighborhood arts development ($239,000), support of programming via the media ($237,000), technical assistance ($230,000), direct support of individual artists in pursuit of their art ($218,000), and research ($200,000).

-- less than 0.5% each for experimentation within art forms ($156,000), documentation (oral history, etc.)($130,000), literary publications ($109,000), establishment of new cultural organizations ($98,000), purchase by arts organization of visual arts objects ($71,000), arts management training ($43,000), communication/collaboration between sections of the cultural community ($27,000), humanities projects ($18,000) and miscellaneous other activities ($65,000).

The "program support" category, for which a plurality of expenditures were made, is a somewhat all-encompassing type of activity, and the large proportion of expenditures made for this purpose indicates that state arts agencies tend to view project expenditures going more for general types of activities than for the specific uses listed. This could be interpreted as a leaning toward general rather than project support, an interpretation reinforced by the relatively high 16% of expenditures for staff salary support and 14% that actually did go for basic operating support.

The 13% of project expenditures made for direct support of individual artists (12% for services and 1% in pursuit of their work) is another indication that despite the small percentage of artists among primary recipients the states were making an effort to support the individual artists as secondary recipients. Furthermore, a substantial 8% of project expenditures are largely for individual artists, 5% through artists-in-schools projects and 3% in artists-in-residence projects

The only other type of activity accounting for a major proportion of project expenditures was touring, with more than half of the 7% expended on touring being used for tours entirely within the state boundaries.

Types of Activity Assisted by Project Expenditures, by State

Some states describe a very large proportion of their project expenditures under the "program support" category; 75% of the fiscal 1974 project expenditures in Puerto Rico was characterized under this category, as was 79% in California, 90% in Utah, and all 100% in Alabama.

The proportion of funds going to some of the specific types of activities varied greatly among individual states. Staff salary support, for example, which was an activity assisted by 16% of total project expenditures, accounted for none of the expenditures in 19 agencies, but rose as high as 30% each in New Mexico and New York. Even sharper differences were seen in project expenditures for basic support of institutions and organizations: 18 agencies made no project expenditures for basic support and another 26 spent less than $1.00 in $4.00 for this, but the proportion rose as high as 49% of expenditures for basic support of institutions and organizations in Missouri and 73% in North Dakota.

Touring was another activity for which the proportion expended differed sharply among states. Touring within the state, which accounted for only 4% of project expenditures overall, received at least $1.00 in every $4.00 in Kansas (27%), Wisconsin (28%), Indiana (41%) and Maryland (47%), indicating the movement of indigenous cultural resources throughout those states. In contrast, states with a lack of cultural resources were naturally more likely to bring in outside touring organizations or individuals, and touring from out of state into the state -- 2% of overall project expenditures -- accounted for 33% of the expenditures in Alaska and 25% in Guam.

In New York State, a high 26% of project expenditures was for direct support of individual artists for specific services; in this respect it should be remembered that individual artists were not primary recipients of any project expenditures of the New York agency. The entire 26% was subgranted.

As noted in Chapter I, in Hawaii 1% of the funds for the construction of state buildings is spent for art works, and these funds are reflected in the high 50% of project expenditures in Hawaii going for the commission of visual arts creations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 76
PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$267	$398	$120	$229	$415	$938	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Program support of institution or organization	10,120	29	100	8	7	16	56	79	65	16	29	49	38	46	15	25	21	62
Staff salary support	5,571	16	-	1	-	9	1	7	4	10	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	3
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	4,876	14	-	1	25	21	7	*	-	30	-	22	16	-	-	6	17	-
Direct support of individual artists for specific services, such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.	4,294	12	-	*	-	7	*	3	1	1	-	-	1	2	19	*	2	1
Touring	2,330	7	-	44	47	16	2	*	5	7	19	-	13	7	35	9	11	1
(Touring within state)	(1,532)	(4)	(-)	(9)	(-)	(11)	(2)	(*)	(1)	(1)	(17)	(-)	(6)	(7)	(-)	(2)	(4)	(1)
(Touring from out of state into state)	(703)	(2)	(-)	(33)	(14)	(5)	(-)	(-)	(4)	(5)	(2)	(-)	(7)	(-)	(25)	(7)	(6)	(-)
(Touring from within state to out of state)	(95)	(*)	(-)	(2)	(33)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(1)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(10)	(-)	(1)	(-)
Artists-in-schools projects	1,743	5	-	16	-	9	26	*	14	9	12	-	15	19	17	1	11	3
Artists-in-residence projects	902	3	-	7	-	2	2	-	2	5	9	-	1	5	-	-	3	5
Other education projects (scholarships, fellowships, lectures, courses, etc.)	754	2	*	10	11	5	5	2	-	2	4	18	3	1	1	*	16	6
Informational publications, conferences and other informational sources	478	1	-	1	1	1	-	3	*	5	8	-	*	1	1	2	-	5
Commission by organization of visual arts creations	437	1	-	1	-	10	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	*	50	7	1
Commission by organization of performing arts creations	312	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	*	-	1	1	*
Conservation/preservation	310	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	*
Audience development	304	1	-	*	6	-	-	-	-	1	7	11	-	-	*	1	-	6
Improvement of visual environment	281	1	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Community or neighborhood arts development	239	1	-	1	-	-	-	*	*	2	3	-	-	5	2	-	-	2
Support of programming via the media	237	1	-	*	-	-	-	2	-	1	*	-	-	-	-	*	2	1
Technical assistance	230	1	-	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	2	-	4	1	2	*	-	*
Direct support of individual artists in pursuit of their art	218	1	*	-	-	3	-	1	-	3	*	-	-	5	-	*	2	*
Research	200	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	*
Experimentation within art forms	156	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	6	-	1	*
Documentation (oral history, etc.)	130	*	-	1	3	-	*	-	-	*	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	1
Literary publications	109	*	-	1	-	-	-	*	2	*	*	-	-	-	-	4	-	*
Establishment of new cultural organizations	98	*	-	*	-	-	-	2	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	*

(Continued)

Table 76

PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (Continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$267	$398	$120	$229	$415	$938	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Purchases by organization of visual arts objects	71	*	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	6	-	*	*	*
Arts management training	43	*	-	*	-	*	*	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Communications/collaboration between sections of cultural community	27	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	1	*	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Humanities project	18	*	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	65	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 76
PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana 1/	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures	34,553	100	$385 % 100	$254 % 100	$209 % 100	$342 % 100	$124 % 100	$312 % 100	$510 % 100	$558 % 100	$715 % 100	$439 % 100	$209 % 100	$742 % 100	$142 % 100	$178 % 100	$134 % 100	$201 % 100	$582 % 100	$175 % 100	$15,113 % 100
Program support of institution or organization	10,120	29	2	54	30	40	66	25	21	59	20	29	46	35	24	28	45	39	42	31	16
Staff salary support	5,571	16	11	4	4	17	11	8	*	18	8	-	17	-	-	-	1	11	3	30	30
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	4,876	14	-	7	-	4	-	-	20	2	32	1	6	49	29	-	31	33	29	-	17
Direct support of individual artists for specific services, such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.	4,294	12	6	*	3	5	1	-	3	3	1	1	*	-	6	-	6	3	*	-	26
Touring	2,330	7	47	1	41	5	-	29	47	5	11	26	15	9	24	31	14	3	3	5	*
(Touring within state)	(1,532)	(4)	(41)	(1)	(27)	(4)	(-)	(16)	(47)	(5)	(11)	(18)	(2)	(3)	(16)	(13)	(14)	(-)	(3)	(5)	(*)
(Touring from out of state into state)	(703)	(2)	(5)	(*)	(9)	(-)	(-)	(13)	(*)	(-)	(*)	(8)	(13)	(6)	(8)	(18)	(-)	(3)	(-)	(-)	(-)
(Touring from within state to out of state)	(95)	(*)	(*)	(-)	(5)	(1)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Artists-in-schools projects	1,743	5	12	19	8	12	3	15	3	-	9	14	8	*	1	-	-	-	12	22	*
Artists-in-residence projects	902	3	1	2	6	5	10	3	*	-	8	1	-	*	2	15	-	2	1	-	1
Other education projects (scholarships, fellowships, lectures courses, etc.)	754	2	1	4	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	3	-	*	-	7	*	-	2	3	2
Informational publications, conferences and other informational sources	478	1	7	4	2	*	7	9	-	-	3	4	3	*	-	1	2	1	2	1	1
Commission by organization of visual arts creations	437	1	-	1	-	-	*	3	-	-	*	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	*
Commission by organization of performing arts creations	312	1	*	1	-	-	*	*	*	1	*	1	-	-	*	1	-	-	*	-	1
Conservation/preservation	310	1	1	-	-	-	-	5	-	3	*	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	1
Audience development	304	1	4	-	-	1	*	-	*	*	*	*	-	-	*	1	-	1	4	2	*
Improvement of visual environment	281	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Community or neighborhood arts development	239	1	2	-	1	1	-	1	*	1	2	*	3	*	3	1	-	-	-	*	*
Support of programming via the media	237	1	3	*	1	*	-	-	-	-	*	2	1	-	3	*	-	-	-	-	1
Technical assistance	230	1	1	-	1	7	-	*	2	-	*	6	*	6	4	1	-	*	-	-	*
Direct support of individual artists in pursuit of their art	218	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	*	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	*
Research	200	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Experimentation within art forms	156	*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	1	-	-	*	1	-	-	1	-	-
Documentation (oral history, etc.)	130	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	*	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	1	*
Literary publications	109	*	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	*	2	-	-	-	2	*	-	-	-	*
Establishment of new cultural organizations	98	*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1	-	*	-	*	-	-	1	1	-	*

(Continued)

Table 76
PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Ken-tucky	Loui-siana	Maine	Mary-land	Massa-chu-setts	Mich-igan	Minne-sota	Mis-sis-sippi	Mis-souri	Mon-tana	Ne-braska	Nevada	New Hamp-shire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Purchases by organization of visual arts objects	71	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	1	-
Arts management training	43	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Communications/collaboration between sections of cultural community	27	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	*	-	-	-	1	-	1	*	-	*	-
Humanities project	18	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Other	65	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	*

1/ Based on incomplete data.

(Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 76
PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
	$	%																				
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Program support of institution or organization	10,120	29	22	24	53	52	42	65	75	18	8	20	48	26	90	49	31	49	42	42	17	35
Staff salary support	5,571	16	17	-	8	9	7	2	-	1	6	*	4	4	-	2	-	5	1	-	-	-
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	4,876	14	-	73	3	1	1	22	4	17	2	15	19	-	-	9	-	37	-	7	-	7
Direct support of individual artists for specific services, such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.	4,294	12	-	2	*	-	8	*	-	8	*	3	-	*	-	2	*	-	25	-	1	-
Touring	2,330	7	11	-	5	27	7	-	12	9	14	27	2	12	1	-	17	3	17	16	28	14
(Touring within state)	(1,532)	(4)	(3)	(-)	(5)	(19)	(4)	(-)	(12)	(6)	(7)	(21)	(1)	(10)	(*)	(-)	(6)	(3)	(16)	(16)	(28)	(12)
(Touring from out of state into state)	(703)	(2)	(8)	(-)	(-)	(8)	(3)	(-)	(-)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(-)	(-)	(11)	(-)	(1)	(-)	(*)	(2)
(Touring from within state to out of state)	(95)	(*)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(2)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(*)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(*)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Artists-in-schools projects	1,743	5	14	-	10	-	21	1	-	6	12	4	14	30	8	25	12	5	3	1	7	34
Artists-in-residence projects	902	3	9	-	2	*	5	8	-	27	8	7	*	-	-	3	1	-	3	24	31	-
Other education projects (scholarships, fellowships, lectures, courses, etc.)	754	2	3	*	4	3	2	1	-	*	3	-	1	-	-	*	20	-	3	*	3	-
Informational publications, conferences and other informational sources	478	1	3	-	1	*	-	-	-	*	2	14	1	1	-	2	2	*	1	3	1	*
Commission by organization of visual arts creations	437	1	1	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	*	2	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*
Commission by organization of performing arts creations	312	1	3	-	1	-	*	*	-	1	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	*	5	1	-
Conservation/preservation	310	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	21	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Audience development	304	1	1	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	1
Improvement of visual environment	281	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-
Community or neighborhood arts development	239	1	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	5	5	1	3	1	-	*	6	1	*	-	1	1
Support of programming via the media	237	1	-	-	*	3	*	-	-	-	7	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Technical assistance	230	1	5	-	*	*	1	*	-	-	*	-	*	*	-	1	4	-	-	2	*	6
Direct support of individual artists in pursuit of their art	218	1	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	5	6	-	-	*	1	6	*	-	1	-	1	-
Research	200	1	2	-	*	-	-	*	-	2	*	1	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Experimentation within art forms	156	*	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	12	-	*	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	2
Documentation (oral history, etc.)	130	*	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Literary publications	109	*	6	-	*	-	1	*	-	-	-	1	*	1	-	*	1	-	1	-	1	-
Establishment of new cultural organizations	98	*	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-

(Continued)

Table 76

PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (Continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
		100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100
Purchases by organization of visual arts objects	71	*	-	-	-	3	-	-	7	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
Arts management training	43	*	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-
Communications/collaboration between sections of cultural community	27	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Humanities project	18	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	-
Other	65	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No major differences in the distribution of project expenditures by primary activity was seen by the size of the total budgets of agencies, except that a somewhat larger proportion (51%) of project expenditures of the larger budget agencies ($750,000 and over in total expenditures), not including New York, were for program support, and a smaller proportion (5%) for touring.

Table 77
PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

		Expenditures			
	Total Agencies	Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000** and above
(Number of agencies)	(55)	(15)	(20)	(10)	(9)
Total project expenditures	$34,553	$2,293	$5,501	$5,313	$6,333
	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100	100	100
Program support of institution or organization	29	32	43	31	51
Staff salary support	16	4	6	6	4
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	14	17	6	11	16
Direct support of individual artists for specific services	12	2	4	2	1
Touring	7	14	14	17	5
(Touring within state)	(4)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(3)
(Touring from out of state into state)	(2)	(4)	(4)	(5)	(2)
(Touring from within state to out of state)	(*)	(2)	(*)	(1)	(-)
Artists-in-schools projects	5	9	12	11	4
Artists-in-residence projects	3	6	4	5	3
Other education projects	2	4	2	2	2

---

*Percentages do not total 100 because only major activities (those that received at least $500,000 in project expenditures) are listed.

**Without New York.

Primary Activity by Art Form

Some sharp differences in the distribution of project expenditures by primary activity is seen within the art forms in which the expenditures were made. Higher proportions of the expenditures were made for basic support within the performing arts (music 23%, theatre 22%, and dance 14%)than in public media (9%), visual arts (5%), or literature (3%). Direct support of artists for specific services accounted for larger proportions of expenditures in the performing arts (17% each in music, theatre and dance), and in literature (16%), compared with only 4% in public media and the visual arts. A much higher than average 26% of expenditures in literature was for artists-in-schools projects, accounting for a plurality of such project expenditures. In other art forms, however, a plurality of expenditures were made for program support.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 78
PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY ART FORM
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies	Music	Dance	Theatre	Literature	Public Media	Visual Arts	Other Art Forms
Total Project Expenditures	$34,553	$7,771	$3,547	$4,195	$1,097	$1,673	$4,909	$11,361
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Program support of institution or organization	29	31	25	30	19	34	32	32
Staff salary support	16	7	5	11	5	21	27	23
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	14	23	14	22	3	9	5	11
Direct support of individual artists for specific services, such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.	12	17	17	17	16	4	4	11
Touring	7	11	16	8	*	*	5	2
(Touring within state)	(4)	(8)	(6)	(7)	(-)	(*)	(4)	(1)
(Touring from out of state into state)	(2)	(2)	(10)	(1)	(*)	(*)	(1)	(1)
(Touring from within state to out of state)	(*)	(1)	(*)	(*)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Artists-in-schools projects	5	1	6	2	26	5	5	7
Artists-in-residence projects	3	2	8	*	5	4	3	1
Other education projects (scholarships, fellowships, lectures, courses, etc.)	2	1	3	1	7	4	3	2
Informational publications, conferences and other information sources	1	*	1	1	2	2	1	2
Commission by organization of visual arts creations	1	-	-	-	-	1	8	*
Commission by organization of performing arts creations	1	3	2	*	*	-	*	*
Conservation/preservation	1	-	-	*	-	1	*	2
Audience development	1	1	2	2	-	*	*	*
Improvement of visual environment	1	-	-	-	-	-	*	2
Community or neighborhood arts development	1	*	*	1	*	*	1	1
Support of programming via the media	1	1	-	*	-	10	*	*
Technical assistance	1	*	*	2	1	*	1	1
Director support of individual artists in pursuit of their art	1	*	*	1	4	1	1	*
Research	1	*	-	*	-	*	1	1
Experimentation within art forms	*	*	*	1	6	1	*	*
Documentation (oral history, etc.)	*	*	*	*	-	1	*	1
Literary publications	*	-	*	-	5	*	1	*
Establishment of new cultural organization	*	1	*	*	*	-	*	*
Purchases by organization of visual arts objects	*	-	-	-	-	*	1	*
Arts management training	*	*	-	*	-	-	*	*
Communications/collaboration between sections of cultural community	*	*	-	*	-	*	*	*
Humanities projects	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	*
Other	*	*	-	-	-	1	-	*

Primary Activity by Primary Recipient

As would be expected, the type of activity assisted differs with the recipient of the funds. For example, 48% of project expenditures made to art museums was for staff salary support, compared with only 2% of expenditures to colleges and universities for such support. The channeling of funds to individuals through intermediary grantees is again evident here, with 18% of the expenditures made to professional performing arts organizations, 22% of the expenditures to foundations not associated with the state arts agencies, and 29% of the expenditures to miscellaneous arts and cultural organizations being made primarily for the direct support of individual artists for specific services.

Artists-in-schools projects accounted for a plurality of 25% of project expenditures made to the state arts agencies themselves and 36% of funds to schools and school systems.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 79
PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY PRIMARY RECIPIENTS
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Professional Performing Arts Organizations	"Other" Arts and Cultural Organizations	Own State Arts Agency	Cultural Centers	Community or Municipal Arts Councils	Art Museums	Colleges and Universities	Non-Professional Performing Arts Organizations	Foundations Not Associated with State Arts Agencies	Visual Arts Organizations	Schools and School Systems
	$	%											
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$7,950	$5,925	$4,137	$2,151	$1,755	$1,651	$1,447	$1,248	$1,097	$1,063	$1,026
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Program support of institution or organization	10,120	29	28	27	23	40	38	29	43	54	13	49	20
Staff salary support	5,571	16	10	17	4	19	25	48	2	11	9	28	10
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	4,876	14	26	10	1	23	4	9	3	12	39	7	1
Direct support of individual artists for specific services, such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.	4,294	12	18	29	1	9	3	2	5	1	22	4	15
Touring	2,330	7	10	2	12	1	3	4	16	13	1	2	5
(Touring within state)	(1,532)	(4)	(8)	(2)	(5)	(1)	(1)	(3)	(10)	(11)	(1)	(2)	(3)
(Touring from out of state into state)	(703)	(2)	(2)	(*)	(6)	(*)	(2)	(1)	(6)	(1)	(*)	(-)	(1)
(Touring from within state to out of state)	(95)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(1)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(1)	(-)	(-)	(1)
Artists-in-schools projects	1,743	5	1	1	25	1	2	-	2	1	-	1	36
Artists-in-residence projects	902	3	1	2	5	1	4	*	8	*	1	1	4
Other education projects (scholarships, fellowships, lectures, courses, etc.)	754	2	1	3	1	2	2	1	5	2	1	5	4
Informational publications, conferences and other information sources	478	1	*	1	5	*	4	3	1	*	2	*	*
Commission by organization of visual arts creations	437	1	-	*	9	*	1	-	1	-	2	*	-
Commission by organization of performing arts creations	312	1	3	*	*	1	-	*	1	1	3	-	*
Conservation/preservation	310	1	-	1	3	-	*	1	*	-	*	1	-
Audience development	304	1	1	1	2	*	1	-	1	1	*	-	1
Improvement of visual environment	281	1	-	*	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	*
Community or neighborhood arts development	239	1	*	1	1	*	1	*	1	1	*	1	*

(Continued)

Table 79

PRIMARY ACTIVITY ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY PRIMARY RECIPIENTS (Continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Professional Performing Arts Organizations %	"Other" Arts and Cultural Organizations %	Own State Arts Agency %	Cultural Centers %	Community or Municipal Arts Councils %	Art Museums %	Colleges and Universities %	Non-Professional Performing Arts Organizations %	Foundations Not Associated with State Arts Agencies %	Visual Arts Organizations %	Schools and School Systems %
Support of programming via the media	237	1	*	1	1	*	*	*	1	–	4	*	*
Technical assistance	230	1	1	1	*	*	1	*	1	1	1	*	1
Direct support of individual artists in pursuit of their art	218	1	*	1	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	–	*
Research	200	1	*	*	1	*	6	*	*	*	*	*	1
Experimentation within art forms	156	*	*	*	2	*	*	*	2	1	–	*	*
Documentation (oral history, etc.)	130	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	1	–	1	1	2
Literary publications	109	*	–	*	1	–	*	1	1	–	–	–	*
Establishment of new cultural organization	98	*	*	*	*	*	1	–	2	*	–	*	*
Purchases by organization of visual arts objects	71	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	–	–	*	–
Arts management training	43	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	–	–	–
Communications/collaboration between sections of cultural community	27	*	–	*	–	*	*	*	*	*	*	–	–
Humanities projects	18	*	–	*	*	–	–	–	*	–	*	–	–
Other	65	*	–	*	*	–	–	–	2	–	1	–	–

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Primary Activity by Source of Funds

The primary activity for which a project expenditure was made differed significantly by source of funds. Only 6% of funds from the National Endowment for the Arts used for project expenditures was made for staff salary support, compared with 21% of state funds. Similarly 9% of Endowment funds went to basic support of organizations and institutions compared with 17% of state funds, and only 2% of Endowment funds was for the direct support of individual artists for specific services, compared with 17% of state funds.

Artists-in-schools projects, on the other hand, depended greatly on federal funds. Twelve percent of total Endowment funds -- but 41% of funds from the Endowment other than basic state agency grants -- used in project expenditures was for artists-in-schools projects, as was 44% of funds from other federal sources, but only 1% of state funds was for this type of activity.

Table 80

PRIMARY ACTIVITY[1] ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		State	Federal					Other[3]
					National Endowment For the Arts				
	$	%	State	Total	Total	Basic State Agency Grant	Other[2] Grants	Other Federal	Other[3]
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$23,181	$10,383	$10,088	$7,638	$2,450	$295	$989
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Program support of institution or organization	10,120	29	28	39	39	43	12	41	20
Staff salary support	5,571	16	21	6	6	6	5	-	6
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	4,876	14	17	9	9	10	6	-	13
Direct support of individual artists for specific services such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.	4,294	12	17	2	2	2	5	4	1
Touring	2,330	7	3	13	14	12	17	-	15
(Touring within state)	(1,532)	(4)	(2)	(8)	(9)	(9)	(6)	(-)	(12)
(Touring from out of state into state)	(703)	(2)	(1)	(5)	(5)	(3)	(10)	(-)	(3)
(Touring from within state to out of state)	(95)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(1)	(-)	(*)
Artists-in-schools projects	1,743	5	1	13	12	3	41	44	8
Artists-in-residence projects	902	3	2	5	5	4	9	4	2
Other education projects (scholarships, fellowships, lectures, courses, etc.)	754	2	2	3	3	4	1	-	2

---

[1] Only those activities for which expenditures of at least $500,000 were made are shown.
[2] Includes Endowment Treasury Fund grants and other grants.
[3] Includes local government grants and private funds.
* Less than 0.5%.

Secondary Activities

In addition to the one primary activity or use for which project expenditures were made, agencies were asked to indicate any secondary activities or uses that were also assisted by a project expenditure. As with secondary recipients, the proportion of project expenditures shown as being used for a secondary activity indicates only that these funds were expended in part for such a purpose; the secondary activity is only a supplemental use, and there may be multiple secondary activities for any project expenditure.

Among secondary activities, the general category of program support again ranked highest; however, some types of activities that ranked low on the primary activity list are among the higher secondary activities, particularly support of individual artists for services, educational projects, audience development, and community or neighborhood arts' development.

Table 81
SECONDARY ACTIVITIES ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies	
	$	%
Total Project Expenditures	34,553	100*
Program support of institution or organization	10,751	31
Direct support of individual artists for specific services, such as classroom teaching, park programs, etc.	7,347	21
Other education projects (scholarships, fellowship, lectures, courses, etc.)	6,932	20
Audience development	5,508	16
Community or neighborhood arts development	5,255	15
Touring:		
Touring within state	4,463	13
Touring from out of state into state	655	2
Touring from within state to out of state	340	1
Technical assistance	3,512	10
Staff salary support	3,141	9
Communications/collaboration between sections of cultural community	2,658	8
Informational publications, conferences and other information sources	2,044	6
Artists-in-schools projects	1,726	5
Direct support of individual artists in pursuit of their art	1,432	4
Artists-in-residence projects	1,387	4
Basic (or general operating) support of institution or organization	1,124	3
Experimentation within art forms	1,103	3
Documentation (oral history, etc.)	1,098	3
Research	1,028	3
Purchase by organization of visual arts objects	796	2
Improvement of visual environment	676	2
Conservation/preservation	628	2
Commission by organization of performing arts creations	627	2
Support of programming via the media	477	1

(continued)

Table 81
SECONDARY ACTIVITIES ASSISTED BY PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974
(Dollar amounts in thousands)
(continued)

	Total agencies	
	$	%*
Literary publications	310	1
Establishment of new cultural organization	288	1
Arts management training	208	1
Commission by organization of visual arts creations	205	1
Humanities projects	122	**
Other	1,398	4

---

* Percentages add to more than 100 since multiple responses were possible.

** Less than 0.5%.

Initiation of Projects

The great majority of project expenditures made in fiscal 1974 was for projects initiated by grantees:

-- 72% of expenditures was in response to grant requests submitted for grantee-initated projects.

-- 9% was for projects that were a joint effort of the state arts agency and recipient.

-- 8% was for projects offered by the state arts agency to recipient.

-- 11% was for projects initiated and administered by the state arts agency.

At least half of project expenditures in 37 states was made for grantee-initiated projects, and in Alabama, the District of Columbia, and Pennsylvania, 100% of expenditures was for projects initiated by the grantee.

Expenditures for projects offered by the agencies to recipients accounted for relatively small proportions of funds in almost all states, rising to at least $1.00 in $4.00 only in Maine (25%), Puerto Rico (33%), Virgin Islands (34%), and Rhode Island (36%). Joint efforts, on the other hand, produced projects for which a substantial percentage of expenditures were made in a number of states: more than $1.00 in $4.00 supported projects that were joint efforts of the agency and recipient in 12 states, the proportion rising as high as 41% of expenditures in New Jersey, 42% in Tennessee, 45% in Michigan, and 48% in Maryland.

Sharp differences were also seen among states in the proportion of expenditures for agency initiated and administered projects. No expenditures were made for agency initiated and administered projects in 13 states, but at least half of the funds were for such projects in Alaska (50%), Louisiana (50% of incomplete project expenditures), Vermont (58%), South Carolina (61%), Puerto Rico (67%), Hawaii (69%), Texas (72%), and American Samoa (100%).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 82
INITIATION OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
	$	%																
Total Project Expenditures %	34,553	100	$267 % 100	$398 % 100	$120 % 100	$229 % 100	$415 % 100	$938 % 100	$217 % 100	$938 % 100	$186 % 100	$139 % 100	$421 % 100	$368 % 100	$63 % 100	$672 % 100	$164 % 100	$730 % 100
Grantee initiated project and submitted grant request	24,957	72	100	42	-	25	75	99	56	60	59	100	76	32	37	15	78	98
Project was offered by state arts agency to recipient	2,795	8	*	4	-	2	-	1	2	10	-	-	1	13	1	2	18	-
Project was a joint effort of state arts agency and recipient	3,099	9	*	4	-	32	-	-	21	4	21	-	10	35	27	14	4	2
Project was initiated and administered by state arts agency	3,702	11	-	50	100	41	25	-	21	26	20	-	13	20	35	69	-	-

(Continued)

Table 82

INITIATION OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (Continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana 1/	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Grantee initiated project and submitted grant request	24,957	72	53	43	70	80	23	50	48	74	33	59	64	99	75	92	92	77	36	78	86
Project was offered by state arts agency to recipient	2,795	8	14	2	15	19	10	25	*	*	15	1	8	*	3	4	*	-	-	-	11
Project was a joint effort of state arts agency and recipient	3,099	9	27	12	15	1	17	3	48	26	45	36	20	*	10	4	-	23	41	-	3
Project was initiated and administered by state arts agency	3,702	11	6	43	-	-	50	22	4	-	7	4	8	1	12	-	8	*	23	22	-

(Continued)

1/Based on incomplete data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 82
INITIATION OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974, BY STATE (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
	$	%																				
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Grantee initiated project and submitted grant request	24,957	72	60	98	84	92	94	100	86	25	22	77	20	21	77	42	50	65	33	74	79	65
Project was offered by state arts agency to recipient	2,795	8	17	-	1	4	2	-	33	36	10	-	2	*	8	-	34	3	13	14	-	*
Project was a joint effort of state arts agency and recipient	3,099	9	15	-	1	-	4	-	3	1	7	6	42	7	2	*	14	26	36	8	21	21
Project was initiated and administered by state arts agency	3,702	11	8	2	14	4	-	-	67	38	61	17	36	72	13	58	2	6	18	4	-	14

Only minor differences occur in the initiation of projects by size of total expenditures, with agencies in the $500,000-$749,999 group having the largest proportion of agency administered projects (28%) of the smallest grantee-initiated (50%).

Table 83
INITIATION OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES
WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

		Total Expenditures			
	Total Agencies	Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and above*
(Number of agencies)	(55)	(15)	(20)	(10)	(9)
Total Project Expenditures	$34,553	$2,293	$5,501	$5,313	$6,333
	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100	100	100
Grantee initiated project and submitted grant request	72	69	59	50	70
Project was offered by state arts agency to recipient	8	2	12	5	4
Project was a joint effort of state arts agency and recipient	9	10	14	17	11
Project was initiated and administered by state arts agency	11	19	15	28	15

---

*Without New York

Location of Projects

The state arts agencies were also asked to indicate the type of location -- urban, suburban, or rural -- in which each project funded took place. Many of the projects covered more than one type of location; for example, a touring project might go to all three types of locations, an artists-in-schools project might be conducted in a school system located in two of the types, etc. This overlapping in locations is reflected in the fact that the distribution by types of location adds to more than 100%:

- -- $30,196,000 (87%) was expended for projects in urban locations.
- -- $15,507,000 (45%) went to projects in suburban areas.
- -- $10,499,000 (30%) went to projects in rural areas.
- -- $391,000 (1%) was expended for projects in other types of locations (prisons, islandwide, etc.).
- -- $998,000 (3%) was for projects for which location was not applicable (certain research projects, publications, etc.).

The overlapping of locations is evident if the 87% of funds expended for urban projects is analyzed in terms of other locations in which projects receiving those funds also took place. Projects receiving almost half (46%) of the funds designated as going to urban locations also took place in suburban locations, and in addition some of these took place in towns and rural locations. Projects receiving 28% of the funds designated as going to urban locations also took place in town and rural locations.

The budget size of the agency did not significantly affect the location of projects for which expenditures were made. The proportion of funds for projects that took place at least partially in urban locations ranging only from 73% and 72%, respectively, in the below $250,000 and $250,000-$499,999 agencies to 83% and 81%, respectively, in the $500,000-$749,999 and $750,000 and over agencies.

Table 84
LOCATION OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES***
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		Expenditures			
	$	%	Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and Above**
(Total Number of Agencies)	(55)		(15)	(20)	(10)	(9)
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$2,293	$5,501	$5,313	$6,333
			%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100
Urban	30,196	87	73	72	83	81
Suburban	15,507	45	42	52	55	59
Rural	10,499	30	47	54	55	41
Other	391	1	6	4	*	*
Not applicable	998	3	3	6	3	7

---

* Less than 0.5%
** Except New York.
*** Percentages add to more than 100 because multiple responses were possible.

Previous Funding of Projects

Approximately $2.00 in every $3.00 in project expenditures in fiscal 1974 went to the continued funding of ongoing projects, with an additional 6% being made as the first expenditure in planned ongoing funding by the agencies:

-- $23,194,000 (67%) was expended for the continued funding of ongoing projects.

-- $4,734,000 (14%) was for the anticipated one-time funding of projects.

-- $4,396,000 (13%) was expended for pilot projects.

-- $2,109,000 (6%) was the first expenditure in planned ongoing funding of projects.

Observation:

Clearly patterns of distribution of project expenditures have been established and govern the granting of funds to a large extent.

Although ongoing funding accounted for the major part of expenditures overall, pilot projects or one-time funding accounted for a greater proportion of expenditures in some states.

-- Pilot projects accounted for a plurality of 47% of funds in Florida and 48% in South Carolina, and a majority of 86% in Indiana.

-- Anticipated one-time funding accounted for a plurality of 42% of expenditures in Massachusetts and majorities of 51% in Washington, 55% in Iowa, 56% in Mississippi, 57% in Oklahoma, 57% in Georgia, 62% in Delaware, and 87% in California.

Table 85
WHETHER PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974 WERE CONTINUED FUNDING OF ONGOING PROJECTS, ONE-TIME FUNDING OR PILOT PROJECTS
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
Total Project Expenditures	34,433 2/		$267	$398	3/	$229	$415	$938	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
			%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Continued funding of ongoing projects	23,194	67	66	42		55	58	1	62	46	28	78	44	29	55	81	54	61
Anticipated one-time funding	4,734	14	7	42		15	4	87 4/	17	26	62	7	*	57	20	12	28	16
Pilot projects	4,396	13	9	9		11	17	10	18	14	7	15	47	5	6	*	2	16
First expenditure in planned ongoing funding of projects	2,109	6	18	7		19	21	2	3	14	3	*	9	9	19	7	16	7

(Continued)

1/ Incomplete data.
2/ Does not include American Samoa.
3/ Information not obtained.
4/ At the time of the survey the California Arts Commission, whose grants program was still in its early stages, expected to be dissolved and replaced with a new agency, which subsequently happened.
* Less than 0.5%.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 85

WHETHER PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974
WERE CONTINUED FUNDING OF ONGOING PROJECTS, ONE-TIME FUNDING OR PILOT PROJECTS (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	1/ Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures	34,433 2/		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Continued funding of ongoing projects	23,194	67	6	34	70	46	57	58	75	27	39	51	22	90	77	48	81	55	78	77	87
Anticipated one-time funding	4,734	14	*	55	21	40	3	29	13	42	30	26	56	10	4	13	12	11	9	13	1
Pilot projects	4,396	13	86	1	3	7	23	3	3	4	19	5	7	*	13	36	*	22	6	8	12
First expenditure in planned ongoing funding of projects	2,109	6	8	10	6	7	17	10	9	27	12	18	15	*	6	3	7	12	7	2	-

(Continued)

1/ Based on incomplete data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 85

WHETHER PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974 WERE CONTINUED FUNDING OF ONGOING PROJECTS, ONE-TIME FUNDING OR PILOT PROJECTS (Continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies		North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
	$	%																					
Total Project Expenditures	34,433[2/]		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Continued funding of ongoing projects		67	62	78	42	31	60	82	100	26	28	46	68	39	97	66	55	66	42	38	36	54
Anticipated one-time funding	4,734	14	18	9	11	57	-	4	-	13	17	31	24	29	1	10	19	16	51	31	35	3
Pilot projects	4,396	13	6	2	11	6	29	10	-	26	48	-	4	16	-	11	15	10	4	27	29	15
First expenditure in planned ongoing funding of projects	2,109	6	14	11	36	6	11	4	-	35	7	23	4	16	2	13	11	8	3	4	-	28

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A majority (64%) of the ongoing projects for which project expenditures in fiscal 1974 represented continued funding had been funded before that time for two to three years, and another 20% had been funded for four years:

Table 86
NUMBER OF YEARS ONGOING PROJECTS HAD BEEN FUNDED

	Total agencies
	#
Total ongoing projects for which expenditures were made in fiscal 1974 as part of continued funding	2570
	%
	100
1 year	2
2 years	39
3 years	25
4 years	20
5 years	5
More than 5 years	9

Average number of years: 3

Furthermore, state arts agencies expect further continued funding of the ongoing projects. The agencies report planning no further continued funding of only 4% of the ongoing projects.

Table 87
WHETHER CONTINUED FUNDING OF ONGOING PROJECTS IS ANTICIPATED

	#
Total ongoing projects for which expenditures were made in fiscal 1974 as part of continued funding	2570
	%
	100
Anticipate further funding	76
Do not anticipate further funding	4
Not sure	20

Observation:

Since most state arts agencies have been in existence for much longer than 3 years, it is possible that the 3-year average period of continuing funding might indicate an unwillingness to be tied in to recipients on a support basis, similar to the pattern of private foundations. It is more likely, however, that as the funds available to the state arts agencies have increased, new projects have been added, as well as the initiation of new projects by previous recipients of expenditures.

Audiences and Attendance

The data supplied by the state arts agencies on audiences and attendance at projects for which expenditures were made was in many cases limited, and information was not available for many project expenditures. On the basis of the data supplied, however, the state arts agencies indicated that 41% of the expenditures in fiscal 1974 was made for projects in which audiences were not involved (such as staff salary support, research, conservation, arts management training, etc.), while 51% of the expenditures went to projects that were primarily directed toward general audiences. Among special audiences, which may overlap each other as well as the general audiences, children and/or youths in school groups accounted for the largest propotion of expenditures:

-- $15,574,000 (51%) was expended for projects primarily directed toward general audiences.

-- $5,686,000 (16%) was for projects directed to children/youth in school groups.

-- $3,053,000 (9%) was for projects directed to children/youth outside of school groups.

-- $3,097,000 (9%) was for projects directed to college/university students.

- $2,981,000 (9%) was for projects directed to ethnic or racial minorities.
- $2,286,000 (7%) was for projects directed to the economically disadvantaged.
- $1,408,000 (4%) was for projects directed to the elderly.
- $926,000 (3%) was for projects directed to the physically or mentally handicapped.
- $364,000 (1%) was for miscellaneous other special audiences.
- $14,069,000 (41%) was for projects in which no audience was involved.

Attendance figures were also limited in many cases. Furthermore, state arts agencies generally rely on project recipients for attendance figures, and these are likely to be estimates at best. Care should thus be taken in drawing any conclusions or making any interpretations of the significance of these data.

Attendance figures were reported for 3,600 projects that accounted for $16,295,000, or 47% of the total expenditures. Attendance at these projects were reported at 57,101,000 people, or an average attendance of 15,900 per project -- any one of which may have covered a number of performances, exhibitions, etc. -- for those projects for which attendance was reported.

Agencies were also asked the number of artists and/or organizations that were involved in projects. The number of artists was reported for 2,554 projects, accounting for $8,345,000, or 24% of total expenditures. A total of 52,765 artists were involved in these projects, or an average of 21 per project.

The number of organizations or institutions was reported for 6,298 projects, accounting for $32,063,000, or 97% of total expenditures. A total of 13,526 organizations or institutions were involved in these projects, or an average of 2 per project.

Matching Funds

As noted in Chapter III, where matching funds are required, the requirements are likely to be either 100% or to vary with the project expenditures, and in some cases there are no matching requirements. In total, requirements for matching funds amounted to slightly less than half the project expenditures, but it is important to note that the actual amount of matching funds exceeded the total project expenditures:

- State arts agencies required a total of $15,841,000* in matching funds, 46% of the total project expenditures of $34,553,000.
- Actual matching funds totaled $42,395,000, constituting 123% of the total project expenditures.
- 35% of actual matching funds came from earned income, 7% from National Endowment for the Arts funds, 1% from other federal funds, and 48% from other cash, with only 9% representing in-kind contributions.

In only a few states required matching funds amount to 100% of all project expenditures -- Alabama, District of Columbia, and Nebraska -- and in one, California, matching funds were 192%. However, the actual matching exceeded 100% in all but 11 states.

---

*Data on matching funds were not obtained from American Samoa and Louisiana.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 88
MATCHING FUNDS FOR PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$267	$398	$120	$229	$415	$938	$217	$938	$186	$139	$421	$368	$63	$672	$164	$730
		% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100
Required matching funds	15,841	46	100	38	1/	66	9	192	77	64	64	100	99	32	70	32	93	7
Actual matching funds	42,395	123	277	74		206	42	274	214	131	178	156	489	57	179	103	144	13
Sources of Matching Funds:																		
Earned income		35	79	7		43	-	28	40	21	-	-	6	22	-	58	16	65
National Endowment for the Arts		7	*	-		1	-	17	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Other federal funds		1	-	-		-	-	1	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-
Other cash		48	17	52		46	88	50	41	64	62	100	91	24	1	39	40	31
In-kind		9	4	41		10	12	4	19	13	38	-	1	54	99	3	44	4

(Continued)

1/ Information not available
* Less than 0.5%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 88
MATCHING FUNDS FOR PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974 (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana 1/	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$385	$254	$209	$342	$124	$312	$510	$558	$715	$439	$209	$742	$142	$178	$134	$201	$582	$175	$15,113
		% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100	% 100
Required matching funds	15,841	46	46	89	98	56	1/	84	76	52	41	75	70	94	85	100	-	91	54	77	20
Actual matching funds	42,395	123	101	172	236	141		136	387	117	122	314	161	583	246	273	-	272	204	126	24
Sources of Matching Funds:																					
Earned income		35	100	31	72	38		72	39	19	74	15	*	57	66	31	-	48	20	-	*
National Endowment for the Arts		7	-	-	2	-		-	8	3	1	12	-	7	2	1	-	-	-	-	25
Other federal funds		1	-	*	*	-		-	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other cash		48	-	33	16	39		28	48	69	19	52	98	36	8	55	-	26	76	36	75
In-kind		9	-	36	10	23		-	3	8	5	21	2	-	23	12	-	26	4	64	*

(Continued)

1/Based on incomplete data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 88
MATCHING FUNDS FOR PROJECT EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL 1974 (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total Project Expenditures	34,553		$364	$169	$929	$140	$207	$738	$286	$316	$528	$165	$398	$617	$205	$174	$243	$295	$359	$506	$176	$149
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Required matching funds	15,841	46	42	82	82	96	71	99	12	36	36	77	36	29	87	42	58	69	76	45	76	87
Actual matching funds	42,395	123	75	786	328	288	363	478	29	41	73	162	103	29	91	125	180	200	226	114	292	171
Sources of Matching Funds:																						
Earned income		35	96	14	33	34	2	72	83	65	*	38	1	30	74	1	3	46	20	34	50	10
National Endowment for the Arts		7	3	–	5	–	–	5	–	3	5	60	–	–	–	–	–	3	2	15	*	*
Other federal funds		1	*	–	1	2	–	2	–	–	1	–	*	–	–	–	–	1	*	2	–	–
Other cash		48	1	82	51	51	95	18	13	27	67	2	34	70	9	98	78	50	65	45	12	23
In-kind		9	*	4	10	13	3	3	4	5	27	–	65	*	17	1	19	*	13	4	38	67

Cost of Projects

In reporting their project expenditures for fiscal 1974, state arts agencies were asked as a final question concerning these expenditures to report the total cost of the projects for which the expenditures were made. In those cases where the expenditure was made for the basic operating support of an institution or organization, the agency was asked to indicate the recipient's total operating budget.

Agencies did not always have available data on the total costs of project or total operating budgets. The incomplete information that was reported, however, indicates that on the average project expenditures by the state arts agencies amounted to slightly less than one-third of the costs of the projects for which they were made and that expenditures for basic support were approximately one-eighth of the operating budgets of the organizations receiving such support. However, because of the second-hand reporting of total costs of projects, care should be taken in drawing any conclusions from these data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 89
TOTAL COSTS OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois
Total Project Expenditures for Other Than Basic Support[1]	28,008		$267	$395	—[2]	$179	$385	$934	$217	$652	$186	$99	$339	$354	$63	$633	$132	$729
			%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total cost of projects for which expenditures were made	88,933	317	377	198		233	216	373	359	288	296	248	341	209	285	190	238	472
Total Project Expenditures for Basic Support[1]	2,143		-	$1		$41	$30	$4	-	$262	-	$30	$48	-	-	$39	$17	-
			%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total operating budgets of institutions/organizations receiving the basic support	16,679	778	-	975		742	683	1,707	-	1,310	-	229	3,229	-	-	874	332	-

(Continued)

---

[1] Only those expenditures for which total cost of project in total operating budgets is reported are shown on this table.

[2] Data on project costs not available.

Table 89

TOTAL COSTS OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974 (Continued)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Ken-tucky	Loui-siana 1/	Maine	Mary-land	Massa-chu-setts	Mich-igan	Minne-sota	Mis-sis-sippi	Mis-souri	Mon-tana	Ne-braska	Nevada	New Hamp-shire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York
Total Project Expenditures for Other Than Basic Support 1/	28,003		$385	$235	$209	$323	1/	$312	$409	$546	$458	$434	$196	$379	$101	$173	$93	$134	$340	$160	$11,364
		%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total cost of projects for which expenditures were made	88,933	317	221	267	336	253		235	411	273	339	447	275	442	437	373	365	347	324	238	317
Total Project Expenditures for Basic Support 1/	2,143		-	-	-	-		-	100	-	232	5	13	-	26	-	41	67	17	-	768
		%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total operating budgets of institutions/organizations receiving the basic support	16,679	778	-	-	-	-		-	828	-	581	6,000	115	-	939	-	411	556	588	-	342

(Continued)

1/Based on incomplete data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 89

TOTAL COSTS OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES WERE MADE IN FISCAL 1974 (Continued)
(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Total Agencies $	Total Agencies %	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total Project Expenditures for Other than Basic Support[1]	28,008		$364	$44	$900	$133	$205	$563	$275	$261	$518	$136	$321	$601	$82	$158	$244	$184	$359	$471	$176	$139
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total cost of projects for which expenditures were made	88,933	317	272	310	445	387	530	587	128	141	192	224	228	250	490	316	284	263	336	234	413	255
Total Project Expenditures for Basic Support[1]	2,143		-	117	30	-	-	40	-	55	10	7	77	-	-	15	-	80	-	35	-	10
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total operating budgets of institution/organizations receiving the basic support	16,679	778	-	308	981	-	-	4,362	-	3,374	254	726	100	-	-	504	-	578	-	314	-	296

Observation:

It is clear that, although the state arts agencies supply valuable funding, the agencies' project expenditures do not constitute the main support of most projects -- although certain projects such as audience outreach may be primarily dependent on this type of support -- nor is the basic support provided by state arts agencies to institutions and organizations the primary component of operating budgets. Consultant directors have suggested, though, that future survival of the arts may lie in a support partnership between the private and public sectors, with the strong participation of government.

CHAPTER V

INTRASTATE AND INTERSTATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

INTRASTATE AND INTERSTATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

In addition to the state arts agency, other state agencies are likely to provide some type of support, directly or indirectly, to the arts. Any consideration of the state picture should take into account the activities of other agencies. Furthermore, that relationships between the state arts agencies and other agencies, organizations and groups within the state -- as well as in other states and on a federal level -- can strongly affect the arts agencies' program and activities.

The survey explored many aspects of these relationships, and this chapter presents the findings in these areas:

Intrastate

- departments of education: the support of the arts by education departments and commissions, and the relationship between state arts agencies and education departments, including any joint programs.
- other state agencies and departments: support for the arts that may be derived from other states agencies and departments, and cooperative relationships between the state arts agency and these other state agencies, including the provision of services, either free or paid, to the state arts agency by other agencies.
- community councils: the importance of community councils to the arts within the state, and the support provided by the state arts agency to the community councils.

Interstate

- regional programming: agencies' participation in regional programming, including involvement with agencies in other states and with regional organizations, and the perceived benefits of and developments expected in regional programming.

General

- evaluation of relationships with individuals, agencies and organizations on the local, state and federal levels.

Departments or Commissions of Education

Education and the arts have long been associated in the United States, and the most likely other state agency to be providing funds for the arts is the department(s) concerned with education. The study explored the known activities of these departments. However, it should be kept in mind that these data are based on the knowledge of the state arts agency directors only and were not derived from the education departments. Directors of 49 state arts agencies reported that, as far as they know, the departments or commissions of education in their state -- covering all levels of education including higher education -- do provide funds for the arts, with only 6 reporting no funds for the arts coming from the education departments.

A majority of those departments of education providing funds do so on all levels of education:

Table 90
LEVELS OF EDUCATION FOR WHICH FUNDS FOR THE ARTS ARE PROVIDED BY EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that report funds for the arts from state education department(s)	49	89
All levels (elementary, secondary, college/university, and adult education)	33	60
Elementary	14	25
Secondary	13	24
College/university	11	20
Adult education	2	4

Types of Arts Activities of Education Departments

Funds for the arts from state education departments cover a very wide range of types of activities. When directors were asked in an open-end question the types of arts activities for which education department funds are provided, to the best of their knowledge, they volunteered many different types of specific activities as well as general areas of programming and means through which activities were funded:

Table 91
TYPES OF ARTS ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH FUNDS ARE PROVIDED BY STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments	49	89
Visual arts	16	29
Music	13	24
Drama/theatre	12	22
Literature, poetry, writing	6	11
Dance	5	9
All arts	4	7
Film-making	3	5
Architecture	2	4
Performing arts (non-specific)	2	4
Crafts	1	2
Employment of arts instructors	12	22
Artists in school programs	6	11
Arts education programs	6	11
Materials	3	5
Touring groups, exhibitions	3	5
Consultants	2	4
Cultural enrichment programs	2	4
Space/facilities	1	2
Contractural services	1	2
Research	1	2
Art instruction in metropolitan areas	1	2
Special school for talented students	1	2
Educational outreach programs	1	2
Artmobile	1	2
Through arts department or programs in colleges, universities	15	27
Through academic arts departments	8	15
Through high school arts departments	7	13
Through elementary, intermediate school arts departments	6	11
Through museums, galleries	3	5
Special arts departments with educational department	3	5
Through Alliance for Art Education	1	2
Community college programs	1	2
Through the Historical Society	1	2
Subsidizing professional arts organizations	1	2
Do not know	1	2

---

[*] Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

It is evident, then, that at least two agencies in most states are to at least some degree active in support of the arts -- the state arts agency and the department(s) of education. However, their programs are not mutually exclusive, and in fact most of them do at least some work together, with almost all in direct contact and a majority conducting joint programs:

Table 92
TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP WITH DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
(Base: Agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	49	100
Arts agency is in direct contact at times with official of education departments	46	94
Not in direct contact	3	6
Arts agency conducts joint programs with education departments	38	78
No joint programs	11	22

The type of joint programs most frequently mentioned in response to an open-end question was the artists-in-schools program, but again directors mentioned a variety of types of activities included in the joint programs:

Table 93
JOINT PROGRAMS CONDUCTED WITH EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS*
(Base: Agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	49	100
Total agencies that conduct joint programs	38	78
Dance	6	12
Drama/theatre	5	10
Visual arts	4	8
Poetry/writing	3	6
Film	3	6
Music	2	4
Arts (non-specific)	2	4
Artists-in-schools programs	28	57
Lecture series, seminars, workshops	7	14
Touring performances, exhibitions	5	10
Arts programs in schools	5	10
Alliance for Arts Education programming	4	8
Research	4	8
Residency programs	4	8
Title III programs	3	6
State planning	3	6
Arts and education conference	2	4
Curriculum development programs	2	4
Community arts programs	2	4
Youth activities	2	4
Liaison on administration of programs	2	4
Exemplary programs identification	2	4
Education outreach programs	2	4
Summer camps, institutions	2	4
In-service teacher training	2	4
Use of federal funds	1	2
Lecture, workshops for teachers	1	2
Young audiences	1	2
Foxfire programs	1	2
Teaching of the performing arts by professionals	1	2
Cooperation between artists and schools	1	2
Workshops with university extension	1	2
Visual aids	1	2
Arts advisory committees	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

In addition to questions concerning their knowledge of the existence of support by the departments of education, the state arts agency directors were also asked an open-end question on which areas they feel the support of the arts by education departments is most effective and which most lacking. The directors ranked the artists-in-schools programs highest among those most effective, and the level of funding as most lacking. The areas volunteered in both categories by more than one director are shown in the following tables:

Table 94
AREAS OR TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN WHICH SUPPORT OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS IS MOST EFFECTIVE AND BENEFICIAL TO THE ARTS*

(Base: Agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	49	100
Artists in schools	10	20
Visual arts	9	18
Music	9	18
Involvement in arts programs	8	16
High school programs	3	6
Staff support to develop arts in school systems	3	6
Bring arts into the core curriculum	2	4
Supplying quality teachers, support on teachers level	2	4
Cooperation between agencies	2	4
Higher education programs	2	4
Residency programs	2	4
Arts programs for general public	2	4

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Table 95
AREAS OR TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN WHICH SUPPORT OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS IS MORE SERIOUSLY LACKING*
(Base: Agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	49	100
Lack of funding	11	22
Lack of statewide coordination, support of dance education	8	16
Lack of statewide coordination, support of drama education	7	14
Arts not considered core curriculum or offered at all grade levels	7	14
Not enough arts programs	5	10
Lack of effective overall state arts education leadership and/or organizations	5	10
Lack of statewide coordination, support of music education	4	8
In elementary education	4	8
Not enough statewide coordination, support of visual arts education	4	8
No artist-in-schools program	4	8
Secondary arts education	3	6
University arts education	3	6
Low quality programs and activities	2	4
Lack of support for professional artist	2	4
Insufficient use of community arts resources	2	4
Lack of in-depth programs for participation in the arts	2	4
Lack of dialogue with arts teachers	2	4
Lack of statewide coordination, support of literature programs	2	4
Lack of arts education in rural areas	2	4
Insufficient training of teachers	2	4
Lack of support for arts outside regular school curriculum	2	4
Lack of statewide support of performing arts education	2	4
Not enough support for arts education generally	2	4
Lack of arts representatives on department staff	2	4

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Evaluation of Relationship With Education Departments

The directors of the state arts agencies report generally good working relationships with the education departments. In rating these relationships only 3 directors felt the relationship was negative and 1 reported no relationship:

Table 96
RATING OF RELATIONSHIP WITH EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS
(Base: Agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	49	100
Very positive	19	39
Somewhat positive	26	53
Somewhat negative	3	6
Very negative	-	-
No relationship (volunteered)	1	2

Directors of approximately two-thirds of agencies in states where education departments provide arts funding see trends and shifts in their relationships with those departments, and these directors generally tend to believe these trends will be in a positive direction:

Table 97
WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN RELATIONSHIP WITH DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION ARE FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS
(Base: Agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	49	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	33	67
No trends or shifts	16	33

Table 98
TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN RELATIONSHIP WITH DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION FORESEEN DURING COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*
(Base: Agencies that report funds for the arts from state education departments)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	49	100
Agencies that foresee trends or shifts	33	67
More cooperation and joint planning, closer relationships	20	41
Joint funding of programs	4	8
Introduction/expansion of artists-in-schools programs	3	6
More arts within curriculum	3	6
Staff changes in education department, addition of arts personnel	2	4
Better evaluative programs	2	4
More positive attitude by education department toward the arts	1	2
Growing awareness of agency and Endowment resources	1	2
Support by agency of elementary arts programs	1	2
Greater use of outside artists and resources	1	2
Increase in teacher training	1	2
Development of statewide coordinators	1	2
Difficulty in obtaining funds for programming to meet needs	2	4
Director of education department could retire	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

From the viewpoints of state art agency directors, relationships between the agencies and education departments are good and getting better. If the trends foreseen towards more cooperation and planning do come about, they will even improve. However, a full picture of the state arts agency relationship would require a survey of the education departments, including amount of funding going to the arts from the education departments.

Activities of Other State Agencies and Departments

In addition to the departments or commissions of education, other agencies and departments in many states provide support of some type to the arts and culture, and directors of 44 state arts agencies reported that they knew of at least one other agency or department that did provide support to the arts. Again, all information was collected only from the state arts agencies, and it was thus impossible to place any dollar amount on the arts support by other agencies.

Table 99

AGENCIES OR DEPARTMENTS OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT OTHER THAN THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT(S) THAT PROVIDE SOME TYPE OF SUPPORT TO THE ARTS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that report knowledge of other agencies providing such support	44	80
Conservation/natural resources	19	35
Health and welfare, mental health, aging	15	27
Economic development, commerce, industry	13	24
Corrections	12	22
Bicentennial Commission	11	20
Historical preservation, historical society	10	18
State library, archives	7	13
Museum	4	7
Highway/transportation	4	7
Tourism	3	5
Public broadcasting authority	3	5
Community affairs	2	4
Agriculture	2	4
Other**	20	36

---

*The list of agencies comprises volunteered responses to an open-end question.

**The miscellaneous "other" category consists of agencies or departments mentioned by only one state arts agency, and included such departments as public safety, secretary of state, and environmental protection.

Table 100
TYPES OF SUPPORT PROVIDED BY AGENCIES OR DEPARTMENTS OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT OTHER THAN THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT(S)*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that report knowledge of other agencies providing support to the arts	44	80
General support of the arts	21	38
Arts in institutions, e.g., hospital, prisons, etc.	20	36
Visual arts exhibitions	15	27
Historical restorations and exhibitions	13	24
Arts in parks, recreation	13	24
Assistance to crafts	12	22
Bicentennial projects	10	18
Community arts projects for senior citizens, low income groups, etc.	9	16
Literature programs	5	9
Performing arts	5	9
Films and/or broadcast projects	3	5
Permitting of non-profit corporate structure	1	2

---

[*] The list of types of support comprises volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Not only are other agencies supporting the arts, but directors of the state arts agencies also tend to believe that such support will increase within the next three to five years:

Table 101
EXPECTATIONS CONCERNING SUPPORT OF THE ARTS DURING THE COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS AND REASONS FOR SUCH EXPECTATIONS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that report knowledge of agencies other than education departments providing support to the arts	44	80
Support by other agencies will increase	31	56
More public demand on every level	12	22
Increasing contacts with other agencies	10	18
Agencies discovering usefulness of the arts	7	13
Advantage to tourism	2	4
Arts consciousness raised by Bicentennial projects	2	4
Increasing influence of council/commission	2	4
Passage of legislation	2	4
Expansion of arts facilities	1	2
Inclusion of arts in hobbies, therapy, etc.	1	2
Existence of design assembly and ad hoc committee	1	2
Has already increased and will continue	1	2
Governor very supportive	1	2
Support will decrease	1	2
Governor scrutinizing all arts money	1	2
Support will remain about the same	10	18
Arts are not given high priority	2	4
Depends on state arts agency, increase only through council/commission	2	4
Revenue picture bleak	1	2
Even in favorable climate no increase	1	2
No other agency promotes arts	1	2
No indication of change	1	2
Lack of positive direction	1	2
Nationwide financial crisis	1	2
Economic reasons	1	2
Not sure	2	4

---

*The lists of reasons for increase, decrease or remaining the same comprise volunteered responses to an open-end question.

In addition to other agencies providing support for the arts, directors of ten state arts agencies reported -- in response to a question on funds from other state agencies -- that in fiscal 1974 the state arts agency had responsibility for planning or administering funds appropriated by the legislature to other state agencies, including the Bicentennial Commission, and such departments as economic development, conservation, public works, health and welfare and the state museum. The funds were appropriated -- according to the directors -- for such purposes as purchasing art work, salaries for personnel, circulating exhibitions, Bicentennial progrms, institutional programs, visiting artists programs, architecture, special urban programs, international exchange of art exhibitions, and museum operations. During fiscal 1974, the directors of the 10 agencies report that the agencies administered an average amount of $58,000 each that was appropriated to another agency.

In response to a question on future relationships with other agencies in the state, 26 directors believe that the situation will change during the coming three to five years in regard to their agencies having responsibility for the planning and/or administering of funds appropriated by the legislature to other agencies, while 28 foresee no change and 1 is not sure. The changes foreseen by the 26 directors include larger amounts of funds to be administered, planning assistance, consultation to other departments, joint planning, and responsibility for other departments, as well as various reorganizations of state government.

In a final line of questioning concerning interstate relationships with government agencies, the directors were asked whether any member of the agency's staff or of the council or commission sat in fiscal 1974 as a representative of the arts agency on the commission or advisory panel of another agency within the state, and vice versa. A majority of the arts agencies had a representative on another agency's commission or panel, but less than one-third had such representatives on their own council or panels:

Table 102
REPRESENTATION TO AND FROM OTHER AGENCIES

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Representative of arts agency sat on commission or panel of other agency in fiscal 1974	29	53
No representative to other agency	26	47
Representative of another agency sits on council/commission or panel of state arts agency	15	27
No representative of another agency	40	73

The agencies on whose commission or panels representatives of the state arts agency sat included the Bicentennial Commission (10 of the 29 agencies had a representative on the Bicentennial Commission), the Title III[1/] advisory council (9 agencies), the education department (5), the historical society or historical preservation board (3), parks and recreation (3), and such miscellaneous other agencies as tourism, corrections, highways, housing, etc. Agencies which had representatives on the arts agency's

---

[1/] The federal elementary and secondary education act for innovative programs in education.

council/commission or advisory panels included the department of education (represented on 9 arts agencies' councils or panels), the legal department (2), the state historical society (2), the state university (2), and such other departments and offices as economic development, planning, parks, etc.

Services from Other State Agencies

In addition to the support of the arts by other state agencies, the state arts agency can benefit from the provision of services -- such as printing, legal or accounting services -- if these services are provided free. Thirty-two of the agencies received at least some such services without having to pay for them:

Table 103
WHETHER REQUIRED TO PAY FOR SERVICES PROVIDED BY OTHER STATE AGENCIES

	Total agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Required to pay for services of other state agencies	21	38
Required to pay for some services, not pay for others	17	31
Not required to pay for services of other state agencies	15	27
Receive no support services (volunteered)	2	4

The types of services that state arts agencies are required to pay for include printing, reproduction and photography (34 pay for such services from other state agencies), motor pools, transportation and car rentals (12), telephone WATS lines (10), accounting, auditing and bookkeeping (8), office supplies (5), data processing (4), personnel services (3), insurance (3), mailing services (3), legal services (2), office machine repairs (2) and maintenance (2).

When asked whether the state provides any support services free of charge, even more agencies -- 43 -- reported that they did receive some services without payment. Fiscal services were most often mentioned (by 23 agencies), followed by legal services (22), advisory and consultative services (9), administrative and management services (7), printing (7), janitorial and maintenance (4), utilities and heating (4), data processing (4), personnel services (3), publicity and public information (2), office supplies and equipment (2), and insurance (2).

A majority of state arts agencies pay rent -- either to the state or to a landlord -- but 14 do not have to pay rent on their facilities.

Table 104
WHETHER RENT IS PAID AND TO WHOM

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Pay rent to commercial landlord	33	60
Pay rent to state	8	15
No rent paid	14	25

Interstate Relationships with Community Councils and Citizens' Groups

Parallel with the rise of the state arts agency movement throughout the United States has been the increasing formation of community arts councils. These councils -- which may be private or governmental -- generally serve neighborhoods, cities, counties or regions. The major programs and activities include coordinating and information services, grantmaking, arts festivals, booking and sponsoring of exhibitions and performances, educational programs, and arts centers.

In only two of the states and territories included in the study -- Guam and American Samoa -- did directors report that there were no community arts councils; in most states, in contrast, community arts councils are important to the arts, and, in fact, a majority of directors of state arts agencies believe community arts councils are very important:

Table 105
EVALUATION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY ARTS COUNCILS
TO THE ARTS IN THE STATE

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Very important	30	54
Somewhat important	17	31
Only slightly important	5	9
Not important at all	1	2
Not applicable	2	4

The state arts agencies are largely active in serving this significant group, although only 5 state agencies are actually legislatively mandated to support community councils. Of five types of assistance about which the survey inquired, a majority of agencies reported for each that they provided such assistance. A funding relationship between the state arts agencies and community arts councils is almost universal with only 2 state agencies not providing project funding grants.

As noted in Chapter IV, 5% of all project expenditures in fiscal 1974 went to community councils. The provision of technical assistance is almost as widespread, only 5 of the agencies in states with councils not providing them technical assistance.

Table 106
SUPPORT RELATIONSHIP OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES
TO COMMUNITY ARTS COUNCILS
(Base: Agencies in states that have community arts councils)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	53	100
Provide funding grants for projects	51	96
Provide technical assistance to community councils	48	91
Assist in establishment of community councils	43	81
Provide basic operating support	32	60
Reimburse community councils for assistance in carrying out state projects	31	58

In addition, 5 agencies mentioned other types of assistance, including programming ideas and cooperative programs, aid in applying for funds and developing information sources.

This relationship between the state arts agency and the community arts councils will become even closer, if the outlook of the directors is correct. Approximately 3 in every 4 directors feel that their relationship with community arts councils will change, and the changes foreseen in response to an open-end question are all positive:

Table 107
WHETHER IT IS THOUGHT THAT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGENCY AND COMMUNITY COUNCILS WILL CHANGE IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS
(Base: Agencies in states that have community arts councils)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	53	100
Will change in coming years	40	75
Will not change	10	19
Not sure	3	6

Table 108
CHANGES THAT ARE THOUGHT WILL OCCUR IN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATE ARTS AGENCY AND COMMUNITY ARTS COUNCILS*
(Base: Agencies in states that have community arts councils)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	53	100
Total agencies that foresee change in relationship	40	75
More interaction, closer relationship	18	34
More councils, assistance in developing councils	10	19
More professional/stronger councils	8	15
Statewide coordination, formation of association of councils	7	13
Increased funding of councils	6	11
More administrative/basic support	6	11
Councils will administer statewide programs of agency	3	6
Greater lobbying support for agency by councils	2	4
Increased activity generally	2	4
Assistance by councils to agency in program and budget planning	2	4
Specialized staff in agency	2	4
New chairman will revitalize	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

As noted above, some agency directors foresee the formation of statewide or regional associations for community arts councils, and already there is a trend in this direction. In fiscal 1974 there were seven such associations of community arts councils, according to the state arts agency directors, and in fiscal 1975 two more associations of community councils were created. The state arts agency assisted in the formation of each of these nine associations and participated in their activities.

In addition to questions about community councils and organizations of community councils, state arts agency directors were also asked about any group or groups of citizens that were organized primarily to advocate the arts in their states, and almost half of the directors -- 26 -- reported that such groups do exist. In some cases the directors mentioned the associations of community councils in this regard, while other types of groups were organized under such names as Artists for Economic Action, Citizens for the Arts, Committee for the Arts, Advocates for the Arts, Alliance for the Arts, Percent for Art and Allied Arts.

Interstate Relationships and Regional Programming

In the exploration of interstate relationships, directors were first asked about their provision of funds to agencies in other states, not including regional organizations. Only a minority of state arts agencies reported having ever given funds to a state arts agency in another state, or to a state agency other than a state arts agency in another state, to act on its behalf.

Table 109
WHETHER FUNDS WERE EVER GIVEN TO AGENCY IN ANOTHER STATE TO ACT ON BEHALF OF STATE ARTS AGENCY

	Total Agencies #	Total Agencies %
Total	55	100
Funds to a state arts agency in another state		
Have been given	10	18
Have never been given	45	82
Funds to an agency other than a state arts agency in another state		
Have been given	7	13
Have never been given	48	87

The giving of funds to agencies in other states is a rare occurrence among state arts agencies, except in the Northeast region. A majority of state arts agencies in that region have given funds to another state arts agency to act on their behalf. The following table shows the number and percentage of state arts agencies that have given funds to agencies in other states, by region:

Table 110
WHETHER FUNDS WERE EVER GIVEN TO AGENCY IN ANOTHER STATE, BY REGION

	Total Agencies		Have Given Funds to Another State Arts Agency		Have Given Funds to Agency Other Than State Arts Agency		Have Not Given Funds to State Arts Agency or Other Agency in Another State	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	10	18	7	13	40	73
Region								
Northeast	9	100	6	67	3	33	2	22
South	17	100	1	6	-	-	16	94
North Central	12	100	2	17	1	8	9	75
West	13	100	1	8	3	23	9	69

Observation:

Consultant directors from that region indicate that the fact that the New England Regional Committee is not a formal organization that can receive funds is the primary reason for the giving of funds directly to another state arts agency.

Regional programming, however, is far more widespread, and, in fact, a majority of state arts agencies are involved in some type of regional programming, with participation in regional organizations climbing over the past few years. Regional organizations in this context was defined as a regional organization of state arts agencies.

Table 111
PARTICIPATION IN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
AND REGIONAL PROGRAMMING

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Participation in regional organizations prior to fiscal 1974	21	38
Participation in regional organizations in fiscal 1974*	31	56
Participation in regional organizations in fiscal 1975	34	62

---

*Twenty-four agencies also reported that they participated in regional programming on an ad hoc basis in fiscal 1974, and of this number 9 were not participating in regional organizations.

The regional organizations and the number of agencies that reported participation in them in fiscal 1974 and fiscal 1975 were:

Table 112
REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH STATE ARTS AGENCIES HAVE PARTICIPATED*

	Total Number of Agencies Participating in	
	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1975
	#	#
Western States Arts Foundation	10	10
New England Regional Committee	6	6
The Upper Midwest Regional Arts Council	5	5
Mid-America Arts Alliance	4	4
Federation of Central State Arts Agencies	4	1
Southern Federation of State Arts Agencies **	2	8

---

* Data based on information from survey and data from the National Endowment for the Arts.

** This organization was in its formative stage in fiscal 1974.

Participation in regional organizations can, naturally, take a number of forms. Most often such participation implies funding on some level, and a majority of agencies participating in regional organizations did contribute funds in both fiscal 1974 and fiscal 1975:

Table 113
CONTRIBUTIONS TO REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
(Base: Agencies participating in regional organizations)

	Fiscal 1974		Fiscal 1975	
	#	%	#	%
Total	31	100	34	100
Contributed funds for general operations and on per project basis	1	3	7	22
Contributed funds for general operations only	7	23	9	26
Contributed funds for per project basis only	12	39	9	26
Total amount contributed	$104,812		$177,102	
General operations	31,500		64,200	
Per project basis	73,312		112,902	

Approximately half of the 21 agencies that were not participating in a regional organization in fiscal 1975 do have plans either to join or to form a regional organization, or to participate in an ad hoc regional project. Four agencies reported planning to join a regional organization and 6 others to participate in an ad hoc regional project. The organizations and projects mentioned are:

Table 114
REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OR PROJECTS IN WHICH PARTICIPATION IS PLANNED

	Total Agencies #
Total agencies planning to join or participate in	10
Pacific Rim program	4
Southern Federation of State Arts Agencies	2
Western State Arts Foundation	1
Regional museum show of artists-in- school work	1
Hispanic advocacy program	1
Exchange program with neighboring states	1
The Upper Midwest Regional Arts Council	1

Regional programming is evidently increasing and state arts agency directors believe that it will continue to do so. A large majority feel that it will increase during the coming years, and no director believes that it will decrease.

Table 115
WHETHER REGIONAL PROGRAMMING WILL INCREASE DURING COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS, AND WHY*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Will increase	50	91
Emphasis at federal level, favored by National Endowment for the Arts	14	25
Trend is in this direction	8	15
Means of obtaining more funding	7	13
Increase in cooperative planning/exchange of ideas	7	13
Sharing of resources	6	11
Broadens program variety	5	9
Requires less expenditure per state	5	9
Need for growth through regional planning	5	9
Services through regional efforts are valuable	4	7
High quality programming	2	4
Makes programs available to state	2	4
Tendency of bureaucracy to expand	2	4
National resources need to tour for survival	2	4
Able to reach smaller, outlying areas	1	2
Professional companies prefer central coordination	1	2
Avoids repetition in nearby areas	1	2
Community program demands	1	2
Provides wider exposure to state artists	1	2
Additional technical assistance	1	2
Will decrease	-	-
Will stay at the same level	3	5
Is not getting off the ground	1	2
Reaching financial limit	1	2
Unique programming situation of agency	1	2
Not sure	1	2

---

*Lists of reasons of increase or staying at same level comprise volunteered responses to an open-end question.

The belief that regional programming will increase is paralleled by a widespread belief that such programming is generally a benefit to the state. Only 5 directors of state arts agencies feel that regional programming does not benefit their state, while 45 feel that regional programming is beneficial; 4 were not sure and 1 believes that "it depends."

The reasons mentioned in response to an open-end question by those who feel regional programming is beneficial are similar to the reasons given for the foreseen increase, with the exception of the emphasis on the federal level:

Table 116
REASONS REGIONAL PROGRAMMING IS A BENEFIT TO THE STATE*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that believe regional programming is generally a benefit to their state	45	82
Requires less expenditure per state	8	15
Exchange of ideas, experience, expertise	8	15
Coordination of touring	8	15
Sharing of resources	8	15
More efficient, can handle programs impossible alone	7	13
Better quality programming possible	6	11
More varied programming	6	11
Wider exposure of state artists	6	11
Access to wide cultural resources	4	7
Enables agencies to receive additional funds	4	7
Larger staff available	3	5
Enlarges arts awareness of population	3	5
Individual states may not have large enough population for some programs	2	4
Larger programs possible	2	4
Enables grants to individuals	2	4
Arts have no boundaries	1	2
Helps satisfy ethnic arts interests	1	2
Less cost to public	1	2
Helps individual regions	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to open-end questions.

Table 117

REASONS REGIONAL PROGRAMMING DOES NOT BENEFIT STATE *

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that believe regional programming is not generally a benefit to their state	5	9
State needs differ within region	1	2
Too expensive	1	2
Not applicable to agency	2	4
Federal concept does not meet real regional needs	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to open-end questions.

In the discussion of regional programming, state arts agency directors were finally asked in an open-end question what they would prefer to see happen in regional programming, and again many of the reasons for which they foresee an increase in such programming and, naturally, their views of its benefits are reflected in their desires.

Table 118

PREFERRED DEVELOPMENTS IN REGIONAL PROGRAMMING*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
More regional programming and planning	17	31
Sharing of programs and resources	12	22
More technical assistance, sharing of expertise	7	13
More reliance on regional organizations	6	11
Touring of major resources, within and outside region	6	11
Long-range planning	5	9
Regionalism only where programs or common needs necessitate, not just for funds	4	7
More resident art groups	4	7
Music programs	4	7
Dance programs	4	7
Better programs	3	5
More assistance to individual artist	2	4
Education projects	2	4
Sharing of costs	2	4
Establishment of regional crafts centers	2	4
Visual arts programs	2	4
Theatre programs	2	4
Not restricted to geographic regions, but based on attitudes and needs	2	4
More funding from National Endowment for the Arts	2	4
Reach widest possible audience	1	2
Regional Councils, Foundations	1	2
Strictly service-oriented, with no direct funding other than to state agencies	1	2
Performing arts programming	1	2
More service programming	1	2
More community development	1	2
Less expensive tour packages	1	2
Decentralization	1	2
Financing of transportation	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

The tables indicate that regional programming is a definite trend throughout the country. Most state arts agency directors feel that it is a positive trend, and one that is very beneficial to their state, but there is some indication that it is felt to be directed at them from the federal level. There is a strong recognition, however, that more and better programming at a more efficient cost is possible if the regional planning and execution is carried out well.

Evaluation of Relationships

In the study of intrastate and interstate relationships, directors were asked to rate their relationships with nine types of groups, agencies or individuals on a scale of very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative. The list and ratings given them -- which, it should be remembered, only reflect directors' perceptions -- are shown in the following table.

Table 119
RATINGS OF RELATIONSHIPS WITH SELECTED GROUPS, AGENCIES OR INDIVIDUALS

	Total Agencies	Very Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Very Negative	No Relationship/Not Applicable	Sure
The National Endowment for the Arts	55 100%	45 82%	10 18%	-	-	-	-
Cultural organizations and institutions	55 100%	35 63%	16 29%	2 4%		1 2%	1 2%
Other state agencies	55 100%	15 27%	36 65%	2 4%		2 4%	-
Local and community arts councils	55 100%	40 73%	10 18%	-		5 9%	-
The legislative leadership	55 100%	17 31%	30 54%	5 9%	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%
The governor's office	55 100%	28 50%	18 33%	5 9%	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%
Local and community governments in the state	55 100%	11 20%	35 63%	2 4%		6 11%	1 2%
The state legislature overall	55 100%	15 27%	29 53%	10 18%		-	1 2%
Major private support sources in the state	55 100%	8 15%	21 37%	6 11%	2 4%	17 31%	1 2%

CHAPTER VI

MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT

This chapter concerns the management of the state arts agencies, covering the following areas:

- position within the state government, i.e., the state arts agency's autonomy as a government agency or office.
- the council or commission, i.e., the governing board of the agency. A number of significant aspects of the council/commission are studied, including:
    - -- the composition and characteristics of members of the council/commission
    - -- the selection and terms of members of the council/commission
    - -- meetings of the council/commission and any of its committees
- the chairman of the council/commission, including the selection and term of office of the chairman, and the communications between the chairman and the state hierarchy. (It should be remembered, that all information was derived from the director, and not from the chairman.)
- the director of the agency (including persons who were serving as acting or interim directors at the time of the survey), including the selection of the director, the characteristics, experience and salaries of directors, activities in which directors engage, and the communications between the director and the state hierarchy.

The final section of the chapter focuses on the decision-making responsibilities of the agency among its management, the state government and the arts community.

Position within the State Government Structure

The position of the state arts agency within the state government structure -- i.e., its independence of other agencies or offices -- could affect the management and decision-making hierarchy of the agency. The greater autonomy an agency has, the greater freedom it possibly could enjoy developing and initiating programs and projects. Approximately half of the state arts agencies are set up as autonomous agencies of the state government and another one-fourth have autonomy as an agency although positioned within a larger agency or department.

Table 120
POSITION OF STATE ARTS AGENCY WITHIN THE STATE GOVERNMENT

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Autonomous agency of state government	28	52
Autonomous agency within a larger agency or department	14	25
Subordinate agency of a larger agency or department	3	5
Office in an agency or department that has purposes other than the arts	5	9
Part of the executive office of the governor	5	9

Being within another agency, department or office, however, does not necessarily mean that an agency is restricted in its activities. Indications are that there may be a trend toward umbrella agencies and departments, in which arts and culture occupy only one section; certainly recent reorganizational legislation in a number of states has been in this direction. As of the end of fiscal year 1974, though, a full majority of 42 of the state arts agencies were autonomous either on their own or within a larger agency. The management structure within the state arts agencies is considered below.

Councils and Commissions

All 55 state arts agencies have some type of council, commission or board. The size of these councils/commissions ranges from 104 in Louisiana to 7 each in Oregon and Puerto Rico. The membership of councils/commissions (not including American Samoa, for which data on councils/commissions were not obtained) totaled 887 at the time of survey, or an average of 16 members per council. (However, the Louisiana council is far larger than any other; the second largest membership after the 104 in Louisiana is 25 each in Connecticut and Delaware.) The median membership is 15, which is also the actual membership in 21 states.

In 14 states, however, there were vacancies on the council/commission at the close of fiscal 1974, the number of vacancies totaling 27. The number of members actually serving was 756 (excluding American Samoa and Louisiana), or an average of 14 per council/commission.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 121
SIZE OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION*

	Total Number 1/ of Membership #	Number of Members Serving at Close of Fiscal 1974 #
Louisiana	104	2/
Connecticut	25	25
Delaware	25	22
North Carolina	24	24
Illinois	21	21
Maine	21	19
Nevada	21	21
Washington	21	21
Arkansas	20	17
California	19	18
Pennsylvania	19	18
District of Columbia	18	18
Texas	18	18
Kentucky	16	14
New York	16	16
Alabama	15	14
Arizona	15	14
Florida	15	15
Georgia	15	15
Indiana	15	15
Iowa	15	13
Massachusetts	15	15
Michigan	15	15
Mississippi	15	15
Missouri	15	15
Montana	15	15
Nebraska	15	15
New Jersey	15	15
New Mexico	15	13
North Dakota	15	15
Ohio	15	15
Oklahoma	15	14
South Dakota	15	15
Tennessee	15	15
Vermont	15	15
West Virginia	15	15
Idaho	13	13
Utah	13	13
Guam	12	9
Kansas	12	10
Wisconsin	12	12
Alaska	11	11
Colorado	11	11
Maryland	11	8
Minnesota	11	11
Wyoming	10	10
Hawaii	9	9
New Hampshire	9	9
Rhode Island	9	9
South Carolina	9	9
Virgin Islands	9	9
Virginia	9	9
Oregon	7	7
Puerto Rico	7	7
TOTAL	887	
Total without Louisiana	783	756

1/Does not include American Samoa, for which data on council/commissions were not obtained.

2/Data not available.

* Listed by total size of council/commission.

Interestingly, the budget size of a state arts agency does not significantly affect the size of the council/commission. Although agencies in the lowerst budget category have a lower average council/commission membership of 13, the average membership was 15 in each of the other budget sizes (excluding Louisiana).

Table 122
AVERAGE MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES[1/]

	Total	Expenditures			
		Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and Over
	#	#	#	#	#
Average membership	14	13	15	15	15

[1/] Does not include Louisiana.

Composition of Councils/Commissions

A somewhat higher proportion of council/commission members are men than women. A large majority of members are white and are between the ages of 35 and 64. The male majority on councils/commissions is particularly high among agencies with expenditures of $750,000 and above, where almost two in three council/commission members are men.

Table 123

CHARACTERISTICS OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION[1/]

(Base: Members serving at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total		Expenditures			
			Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and Above
	#	%	%	%	%	%
Total members serving at close of fiscal 1974	756	100	100	100	100	100
Sex						
Men	420	56	54	54	51	65
Women	336	44	46	46	49	35
Racial/ethnic group						
White	673	89	84	93	92	83
Black	51	7	9	5	6	7
Spanish-American	18	2	3	1	1	7
Oriental	4	1	-	-	-	3
American Indian	3	*	-	1	-	-
Other	7	1	4	-	1	-
Age						
Under 25 years	1	*	-	*	-	-
25-34 years	62	8	13	8	6	5
35-49 years	297	40	37	40	48	34
50-64 years	201	40	37	42	39	39
65 and over	64	8	6	10	6	11
Not sure	31	4	7	*	1	11

[1/] Does not include Louisiana.

Observation:

The male majority on councils/commissions reverses the population ratio; in the 1970 census 53% of adult Americans 21 years and older were women and only 47% men.

The proportion of white members, on the other hand, exactly matches the 89% of the adult population classified as white in the 1970 census.

Occupations of Council/Commission Members

Councils/commissions are to a very large extent populated by people whose professions are not in the arts. People whose occupations are in the arts and cultural fields accounted for only 1 in 5 members, including 15% who are artists, 14% who are on staffs of cultural organizations, 1% who are architects or urban planners, and the less than 0.5% each who are music or dance teachers or gallery owners. In some states -- Florida, Hawaii, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, Nebrasks and Tennessee -- no members of the councils/commissions work in the arts and cultural areas.

Business people (22%), educators (16%), professional people (6%) and volunteers (18%) constitute a majority of councils/commissions, with an additional 8% identified as homemakers. Elected or appointed state officials accounted for only 3% of council/commission memberships overall, but at least 1 in 5 members were elected or appointed officials in California, the District of Columbia, Maryland and Pennsylvania.

The table indicates that generally boards represent a wide range of occupations that could bring expertise from many fields to the work of the agency. It should also be noted that members from occupations not in the arts and cultural fields may still have a great deal of arts expertise even though their professions are elsewhere.

Table 124
OCCUPATIONS OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS
(Base: Members serving at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies #	Alabama	Alaska	American Samoa 1/	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Guam	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa
Total members serving at close of fiscal 1974	756	14	11		14	17	18	11	25	22	18	15	15	9	9	13	21	15	13
	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Business/financial	22	37	18		28	6	17	28	8	14	17	20	33	34	45	15	34	7	23
Bankers, asscountants or other financial experts	5	7	-		7	-	6	-	-	9	6	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-
Retailers	3	30	-		7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	7	-
Other business people	14	-	18		14	6	11	28	8	5	11	20	33	34	45	15	14	-	23
Arts/cultural	20	7	18		14	12	27	18	40	33	23	-	20	22	-	16	14	13	22
Artists	15	7	9		7	6	21	9	20	13	17	-	13	22	-	-	14	13	8
Staffs of cultural organizations	14	-	-		-	6	6	9	20	5	6	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	14
Architects/urban planners	1	-	9		7	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Music/dance teachers	*	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	7	-	-	8	-	-	-
Gallery owners	*	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Education	16	21	37		21	24	6	27	16	24	17	20	-	33	22	8	-	20	31
Teachers--college/university	7	-	28		14	18	6	18	4	13	-	7	-	22	11	8	-	7	23
Educational administrators	6	14	-		7	6	-	9	8	5	17	13	-	11	-	-	-	13	-
Teachers--elementary/secondary	3	7	9		-	-	-	-	4	5	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	8
Professional	6	14	-		14	12	6	9	12	5	11	14	7	-	11	8	19	-	-
Lawyers	5	-	-		7	6	6	9	8	5	11	7	7	-	-	8	19	-	-
Doctors	1	14	-		7	6	-	-	4	-	-	7	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
Media	5	-	-		-	6	6	-	4	-	-	13	7	11	-	8	14	13	8
Critics	1	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other media	4	-	-		-	6	6	-	4	-	-	13	17	11	-	8	14	13	8
Volunteers active in civic affairs, not otherwise employed	18	14	18		23	34	17	9	12	13	11	33	-	-	22	45	-	47	8
Homemakers	8	7	-		-	6	-	9	8	13	-	-	26	-	-	-	19	-	-
Elected or appointed state officials	3	-	-		-	-	21	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union officials	1	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1		9			-		-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	8

(continued)

-240-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 124
OCCUPATIONS OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS (continued)
(Base: Members serving at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana 1/	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota
	#																			
Total members serving at close of fiscal 1974	756	10	14		19	8	15	15	11	15	15	15	15	21	9	15	13	16	24	15
	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Business/financial	22	10	-		16	13	27	20	36	60	27	-	46	22	22	20	8	31	21	7
Bankers, accountants or other financial experts	5	10	-		-	-	7	13	27	20	7	-	20	5	-	7	8	6	-	7
Retailers	3	-	-		16	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other business people	14	-	-		-	13	20	7	-	40	20	-	20	17	22	13	-	25	17	-
Arts/cultural	20	10	14		5	26	52	13	-	-	-	46	-	29	11	40	23	45	21	32
Artists	15	10	14		5	13	26	13	-	-	-	46	-	14	11	20	23	37	21	32
Staffs of cultural organizations	14	-	-		-	13	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	13	-	-
Architects/urban planners	1	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-
Music/dance teachers	*	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gallery owners	*	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	7	-	-	-	-
Education	16	10	14		22	26	14	27	9	20	14	14	14	15	11	13	15	6	12	20
Teachers--college/university	7	10	-		11	13	-	7	9	13	7	7	-	5	-	-	-	6	4	20
Educational administrators	6	-	14		11	13	7	13	-	7	-	-	7	-	11	13	15	-	4	-
Teachers--elementary/secondary	3	-	-		-	-	7	7	-	-	7	7	7	10	-	-	-	-	4	-
Professional	6	10	7		11	13	-	7	9	-	20	-	7	-	11	-	46	-	-	7
Lawyers	5	10	7		11	13	-	7	-	-	20	-	7	-	11	-	46	-	-	7
Doctors	1	-	-		-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Media	5	-	-		10	-	7	-	-	20	-	-	-	5	-	7	-	6	4	7
Critics	1	-	-		5	-	7	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other media	4	-	-		5	-	-	-	-	20		-	-	5	-	7	-	6	4	7
Volunteers active in civic affairs, not otherwise employed	18	60	-		31	-	-	33	-	-	32	40	39	14	11	20	8	0	39	27
Homemakers	8	-	58		5	-	-	-	37	-		-	-	5	-	-	-	-	4	-
Elected or appointed state officials	3	-	-		-	22	-	-	9	-		-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-
Union officials	1	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	10	-	-	-	6		-
Other	1	-	7		-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-		34	-	-	6		-

(continued)

Table 124
OCCUPATIONS OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS (continued)
(Base: Members serving at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies #	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Puerto Rico	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virgin Islands	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Total members serving at close of fiscal 1974	756	15	14	7	18	7	9	9	15	15	18	13	15	9	9	21	15	12	10
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Business/financial	22	39	7	30	23	-	56	11	7	59	18	16	20	-	11	15	14	8	30
Bankers, accountants or other financial experts	5	-	7	30	6	-	-	-	-	-	6	8	7	-	-	-	7	8	-
Retailers	3	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	6	8	-	-	-	5	7	-	10
Other business people	14	39	-	-	11	-	56	11	7	59	6	-	13	-	11	10	-	-	20
Arts/cultural	20	14	7	28	23	58	11	34	7	-	11	69	46	11	11	28	7	34	20
Artists	15	7	-	14	6	44	11	34	7	-	11	69	39	11	-	18	-	17	20
Staffs of cultural organizations	14	7	-	14	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	11	10	7	17	-
Architects/urban planners	1	-	7	-	6	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Music/dance teachers	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gallery owners	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Education	16	-	7	-	6	14	22	22	39	-	11	-	20	11	11	15	26	34	20
Teachers--college/university	7	-	-	-	-	14	11	-	13	-	11	-	7	-	11	-	13	8	20
Educational administrators	6	-	-	-	6	-	11	11	13	-	-	-	13	11	-	10	13	26	-
Teachers--elementary/secondary	3	-	7	-	-	-	-	11	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
Professional	6	7	7	14	-	-	-	11	7	14	6	-	-	-	11	10	-	8	-
Lawyers	5	7	7	14	-	-	-	11	7	7	6	-	-	-	11	5	-	8	-
Doctors	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
Media	5	7	-	14	6	14	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	11	11	-	7	-	-
Critics	1	7	-		6	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other media	4	-	-	14	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	7	-	-
Volunteers active in civic affairs, not otherwise employed	18	26	-	-	21	-	11	-	33	27	17	15	7	22	34	22	28	8	10
Homemakers	8	-	72	14	-	-	-	-	7	-	37	-	-	34	11	-	13	-	20
Elected or appointed state officials	3	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	11	-	10		8	-
Union officials	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-

1/Data not obtained.
* Less than 0.5%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Boards of Separate Associated Foundations

In addition to the councils/commissions, eleven states had boards of separate associated foundations in fiscal 1974. (The Massachusetts foundation was not fully operational at that time.) The total membership of the eleven boards was 126, and at the close of fiscal 1974, 5 vacancies existed, for a total of 121 board members, or an average of 11 members per board, serving at that time. The size of boards ranged from 25 in Michigan to 5 in Wyoming. (In all eleven states, there is at least some duplication among council/commission members and board members.)

Table 125
SIZE OF BOARD OF SEPARATE ASSOCIATED FOUNDATION

	Total Number of Membership	Number of Members Serving at Close of Fiscal 1974
	#	#
Colorado	6	6
Connecticut	10	10
Florida	15	15
Illinois	21	21
Indiana	6	5
Michigan	25	23
Nebraska	15	15
New York	7	5
Oregon	7	7
South Carolina	9	9
Wyoming	5	5
TOTAL	126	121

The proportion of foundation board members who are men is even higher than that of council/commission members, and the proportion who are white is somewhat higher.

Table 126
CHARACTERISTICS AND OCCUPATIONS OF MEMBERS OF BOARDS OF SEPARATE ASSOCIATED FOUNDATIONS
(Base: Members serving at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total members serving at close of fiscal 1974	121	100
Sex		
Men	82	68
Women	39	32
Racial/ethnic group		
White	114	94
Black	6	5
Spanish-American	1	1
Age		
Under 25 years	-	-
25-34 years	9	7
35-49 years	47	39
50-64 years	51	43
65 years and over	9	7
Not sure	5	4
Occupation		
Business/financial		29
Bankers, accountants or other financial experts		9
Retailers		3
Other business people		17
Arts/culture		18
Artists		12
Staffs of cultural organizations		5
Architects/urban planners		1
Education		16
Teachers -- college/university		2
Educational administrators		12
Teachers -- elementary/secondary		2
Professional		9
Lawyers		8
Doctors		1
Media		5
Critics		-
Other media		5
Volunteers active in civil affairs, not otherwise employed		18
Homemakers		4
Elected or appointed state officials		1
Union officials		-

Observation:

> The even larger proportion of business on the boards of associated foundations than on the councils/commissions is not unexpected, considering the thrust of most foundations toward such areas as fund-raising in the private sector rather than government funding and specific arts activities as in the agencies themselves.

Selection of Council/Commission Members

Directors of state arts agencies report that the governor of the state is influential in the selection of new members of the council or commission. Since the council or commission members are nominally chosen by the governor (or secretary of state) in all states except Vermont, where all members are elected by a membership body, this is not surprising. When directors were asked how much influence each of a list of twelve people or types of people has in selecting new members -- on a scale of "a great deal," "some but not a great deal," "only a little," or "no influence at all" -- more than 90% of the directors reported that the governor of the state has a great deal of influence, and in only 2 states did the governor have no influence at all. The list of twelve and the number of agencies reporting that each had a great deal of influence in selecting new members are shown in the following table:

Table 127
PEOPLE WITH A GREAT DEAL OF INFLUENCE
ON SELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Governor	50	91
The chairman of the council/commission	19	35
The executive director	17	31
Non-elected or appointed state officials	11	20
Other elected state officials	10	18
Current council/commission members	7	13
Arts and cultural organizations	4	7
Individual artists	3	5
The staff of the agency	2	4
Community councils	1	2
Elected local and municipal officials	1	2
Other political leaders	7	13
Newspaper editor (volunteered)	1	2

Observation:

The directors' responses indicate that the arts community--with the exception of any members of that community serving on the current council/commission and the executive director of the agency -- is influential in very few states in the selection of new council/commission members. Basically, the selection process is a political one, and this is reflected strongly in the reasons for which members are chosen.

From a list of nineteen possible reasons -- drawn up by the National Research Center of the Arts in conjunction with consultant agency directors and representatives of the National Endowment for the Arts -- with the opportunity given to add others, directors were asked which were the two or three most predominant as reasons for the selection of members of the council/commission, and which were the two or three that the directors feel should be most predominant in the selection of members of the council or commission. A political reason ranked highest in the former category, while arts-related reasons were selected most often in the latter.

Table 128
TWO OR THREE MOST PREDOMINANT REASONS IN THE SELECTION OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS SERVING AT THE END OF FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Are friends of officials or politicians	19	35
Are successful practicing artists	18	33
Are prominent in public life	17	31
Have political influence	17	31
Represent regions or areas of the state (excluding elected or appointed officials)	17	31
Are patrons of the arts or major collectors	13	24
Are experts in the administration or production of the arts	11	20
Are arts educators	10	19
Are prominent in business	9	17
Are socially prominent	8	15
Are experts in non-arts administrative areas (such as law, accounting, business practices, etc.)	4	7
Represent segments of the population (such as minority groups, etc.)	4	7
Are prominent in foundations or other non-profit organizations	2	4
Are prominent in the labor movement	1	2
Are elected or appointed state or local government officials	1	2
Are politicians (other than elected or appointed officials)	1	2
Are prominent in art criticism or journalism	-	-
Are prominent in film, radio, television	-	-
Are prominent in education (other than being arts educators)	-	-
Other	1	2
Not sure	1	2

Table 129
TWO OR THREE REASONS THAT DIRECTORS FEEL SHOULD BE MOST PREDOMINANT IN SELECTION OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Are experts in the administration or production of the arts	35	65
Are successful practicing artists	27	50
Represent regions or areas of the state (excluding elected or appointed officials)	15	28
Are experts in non-arts administrative areas (such as law, accounting, business practices, etc.)	14	26
Represent segments of the population (such as minority groups, etc.)	14	26
Are patrons of the arts or major collectors	13	24
Are prominent in business	11	20
Are arts educators	10	19
Are prominent in public life	10	19
Have political influence	7	13
Are prominent in foundations or other non-profit organizations	3	6
Are prominent in art criticism or journalism	2	4
Are prominent in education (other than being arts educators)	1	2
Are elected or appointed state or local government officials	1	2
Are friends of officials or politicians	1	2
Are prominent in film, radio, television	-	-
Are prominent in the labor movement	-	-
Are socially prominent	-	-
Are politicians (other than elected or appointed officials)	-	-
Other	4	7

Having political influence was high ranked among the two or three most predominant reasons in the selection of members, but was relatively low ranked among the reasons directors feel should be predominant; furthermore, being friends of officials or politicians was cited by the largest proportion of directors as one of the two or three most predominant reasons, but was selected by only one director as a reason that should be predominant. These differences indicate that the directors believe the councils/commissions are more politically-oriented than they should be.

In contrast, being expert in the administration of production of the arts -- picked by 35 directors, more than for any other factors as one of those that should be predominant -- was actually one of the most predominant in only 11 councils/commissions. Successful, practicing artists are, however, high ranked among both the actual predominant reasons and those that should be predominant.

> Observation:
>
> Despite the low proportions of directors selecting politically-associated reasons as among those that should be predominant, consultant directors have pointed out that the political influence of the council/commission can be an important factor in the successful operations of a state arts agency. The responses indicate, and the consultant directors confirmed, that the general desire is for a board with a balance of business, political and arts members.

Significant variations in reasons for the selection of council/commission members can be seen when the state arts agencies are considered in terms of regional subgroupings. Council/commission members in the Northeast are, according to the directors, much more likely to be chosen for arts-related reasons -- such as being artists, arts educators, are experts in the administration of the arts -- than those in any other part of the country. Only 20% of agency directors nationally reported that expertise in arts administration -- highest ranked among reasons that should be predominant in selection -- actually was predominant, but a majority of those in the Northeast reported arts expertise as a predominant reason for the selection of members in fiscal 1974, and in fact this was highest ranked as an actual reason for selection in that area. In contrast, only 6% of the directors of agencies in the South reported that council/commission members had been chosen for their arts administration expertise, while 53% noted that being friends of officials or politicans, and an equal 53% that having political influence, as a reason for selection.

Practicing artists are more likely to be picked for councils/commissions in the West, where 62% of agency directors said being a successful practicing artist was a predominant reason, compared with 44% in the Northeast and only 18% and 17% respectively in the South and North Central regions.

Table 130
TWO OR THREE MOST PREDOMINANT REASONS IN SELECTION OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS SERVING AT END OF FISCAL 1974

Total	Total Agencies (55)	North-east (9)	South (17)	North Central (12)	West (13)
	%	%	%	%	%
Are friends of officials or politicians	35	33	53	42	15
Are successful practicing artists	33	44	18	17	62
Are prominent in public life	31	33	35	42	15
Have political influence	31	-	53	33	31
Represent regions or areas of the state (excluding elected or appointed officials)	31	22	29	50	23
Are patrons of the arts or major collectors	24	22	18	33	23
Are experts in the administration or production of the arts	20	56	6	17	8
Are arts educators	19	22	6	25	15
Are prominent in business	17	22	6	8	31
Are socially prominent	15	-	29	8	15
Are experts in non-arts administrative areas (such as law, accounting, business practices, etc.)	7	11	12	8	-
Represent segments of the population (such as minority groups, etc.)	7	-	6	8	15
Are prominent in foundations or other non-profit organizations	4	-	-	8	8
Are prominent in the labor movement	2	-	-	-	8
Are elected or appointed state or local government officials	2	-	6	-	-
Are politicians (other than elected or appointed officials)	2	-	6	-	-

Not only are political reasons important in the selection of council/commission members now, but some directors see even more of a trend in that direction. When asked whether they foresee any trends or shifts in the reasons for which council or commission members might be selected during the coming three to five years, 28 directors said they do foresee trends or shifts, with 24 feeling no trends or shifts will take place and 3 not sure. Becoming more political was the most mentioned trend in response to an open-end question on which trends were expected.

Table 131
TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN REASONS FOR SELECTION OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS FORESEEN DURING COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that do foresee trends or shifts	28	51
Becoming more political, increased emphasis on political influence	11	20
Increasing representation of ethnic groups	3	5
More emphasis on business and/or labor	3	5
Greater input from artists	3	5
Fewer patrons of the arts and socially prominent people	3	5
More geographic awareness around state	2	4
Fewer selections for political reasons	2	4
More choice based on ability	2	4
Structuring of council/commission in a more professional manner	2	4
More reliance on recommendations of agency and/or present council/commission	2	4
More representation from the arts	2	4
Changes due to new governor	2	4
Fewer members from major institutions	1	2
Fewer practicing artists	1	2
More experts in non-arts administrative areas	1	2
Greater knowledge of high arts	1	2
Greater influence of community-based organizations or groups	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Observation:

Except for the 11 directors who feel that the selection of members will be more politically oriented, there is little consensus on any movement in this area, and the directors' volunteered responses indicate that it is unlikely that any major change will occur in the bases on which council/commission members are selected.

Terms of Service of Council/Commission Members

Once a commission member is selected, it is likely that he or she will serve for many years, In more than half of the agencies the term of service is at least four years. (Most councils/commissions have staggered terms of service.)

Table 132
TERMS OF SERVICE OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Specified terms	54	98
1 year	-	-
2 years	2	4
3 years	24	43
4 years	15	27
More than 4 years	13	24
No specified terms	1	2
Members' terms are staggered	48	87
All terms end at same time	7	13

Furthermore, on more than three in four councils/commissions members may serve two or more terms consecutively, while on the remaining councils/commissions two or more non-consecutive terms are possible. And, in practice, members of most councils/commissions do serve at least a few terms.

Table 133
NUMBER OF TERMS ELIGIBLE TO SERVE AND NUMBER OF TERMS MOST COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS DO SERVE

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Eligible to serve		
Two or more terms consecutively	43	78
Two or more terms non-consecutively	12	22
Only one term	-	-
Length actually served by most members		
One term	15	27
Few terms	29	52
As long as wish or able	8	15
Not in operation long enough to tell	2	4
It varies (volunteered)	1	2

The likelihood of council/commission members serving at least a few terms is reflected in the fact that a majority of the members serving at the close of fiscal 1974 had been on the council/commission at least three years, and almost one in five had served six years or more. (Most agencies themselves were established in the mid-1960's.)

Table 134
TIME SERVED ON COUNCIL/COMMISSION
(Base: Members serving at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total
	%
Total members serving at close of fiscal 1974 (756)	100
Less than 1 year	15
1 - 2 years	24
3 - 5 years	42
6 - 10 years	18
More than 10 years	1

When asked in an open-end question what change, if any, they would like to see in terms of service of the council/commission members, more than two in five directors expressed satisfaction with the current procedures; however, one in five would prefer a greater turnover of members. Many of the answers to this question hark back to the questions on reasons for the selection of members rather than pertain to terms of service, and they reflect the fact already discussed that members tend to be selected for rea- other than those the directors feel should be the basis of selection.

Table 135
CHANGES DESIRED IN TERMS OF SERVICE OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
None; present system is good	24	44
Shorter terms, limit on terms, greater turnover	11	20
Skip after two consecutive terms	5	9
Staggered terms	4	7
More involvement with overall policy	2	4
Election of chairman by council rather than appointment by governor	2	4
Allow members to serve as long as wish or able	1	2
Utilization of past members	1	2
Fewer new members who have not had contact with council/commission	1	2
Terms of members too tied in with that of governor	1	2
Change of emphasis from volunteer to professional	1	2
More members who are knowledgeable and interested in field	1	2
Regular appointments should be made as law states	1	2
Increased involvement of independent areas	1	2
More direct action outside council meetings	1	2
More experts in non-arts administrative areas	1	2
Do not know	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Meetings of the Council/Commission and Its Committees

One indication of the activity of the council/commission in the programs and policies of the agency is the number of meetings held both of the full council/commission and of its committees. Just under half the councils/commissions are not mandated to meet a specified number of times and only one in ten are mandated to meet more than four times a year, but a majority do meet that often. The average frequency of meeting of at least once every other month indicates that the councils/commissions are relatively active, certainly more active than state laws require.

Table 136
NUMBER OF TIMES COUNCIL/COMMISSION IS MANDATED TO MEET

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Mandated to meet specified number of times per year	30	54
Once	5	9
Twice	5	9
Three times	-	-
Four times	14	25
Five times	1	2
Six times	3	5
Eleven times	1	2
Twelve times	1	2
Not mandated to meet specified number of times	25	46

Table 137
NUMBER OF TIMES COUNCIL/COMMISSION MET
DURING FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Once or twice	5	9
3 - 4 times	16	30
5 - 6 times	14	25
7 - 8 times	6	10
9 - 10 times	10	18
11 - 12 times	4	8
Mean number of times met in fiscal 1974	6.2 times	

It is not unreasonable to conclude that the greater the total expenditures of an agency, the more work there may be for a council/commission, and it is true that the average number of meetings during fiscal 1974 rose steadily with an increase in total expenditures.

Table 138
NUMBER OF TIMES COUNCIL/COMMISSION MET DURING FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

		Expenditures			
	Total	Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and Above
Mean number of times	6.2	4.9	6.3	6.7	7.5

Not only did councils/commissions meet relatively frequently, but most members attended these meetings. In only one agency was the average attendance below 50%, and average attendance was at least 70% at meetings of most councils/commissions.

Table 139
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF MEMBERS ATTENDING COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEETINGS IN FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Attendance		
Below 50%	1	2
50% - 59%	5	9
60% - 69%	10	18
70% - 79%	13	24
80% - 89%	17	30
90% - 99%	4	7
100%	2	4
Majority (volunteered)	2	4
Not sure	1	2
Average attendance	75.5%	

In addition to the full meetings of the councils/commissions, in three out of five agencies meetings were held in smaller committee sessions during fiscal 1974, with the number of such committees ranging from one per council/commission to twelve.

Table 140
WHETHER COUNCIL/COMMISSION MET IN COMMITTEE SESSIONS
DURING FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Did meet in committee sessions	33	60
Number of committees		
1	4	7
2	4	7
3	8	15
4	8	15
5	3	5
6	3	5
7	2	4
12	1	2
Did not meet in committee sessions	22	40

Councils/commissions were more likely to have executive committees (more than half of those with committees had an executive committee) than any other type of committee.

Table 141
NAMES OF COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL/COMMISSION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with council/commission that met in committee session in fiscal 1974	33	60
Executive	17	31
Visual arts/exhibitions/museum	13	24
Budget/finance	13	24
Policy/long range planning/goals and criteria/by-laws	10	18
Grants/funding/subsidy	6	11
Artists-in-schools/education	6	11
Legislative liaison	6	11
Performing arts/dance, theatre, music	6	11
Awards/nominating	5	9
Personnel/staff liaison	4	7
Environmental design	4	7
Special projects	3	5
Literature	3	5
Ad hoc	3	5
Inter-disciplinary	3	5
Cultural-recreation	3	5
Community relations/public relations	2	4
Selection	2	4
Craft	2	4
Touring Artists Register	1	2
Arts service organizations	1	2
Administrative	1	2
Proposal	1	2
Membership	1	2

In all a total of 127 committees were reported by the state arts agencies. A majority of these committees function primarily in the area of policy, or of a combination of policy and grant review.

Table 142
FUNCTIONS OF COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total number of committees	127	100
Policy	43	34
Grant review	14	11
Combination of policy and grant review	47	37
Other areas	23	18

Agencies generally see the committees of the council/commission as being very useful; in evaluating the usefulness of committees on a scale of very useful, somewhat useful, only slightly useful or not useful at all, directors rated an overwhelming majority of the committees as very useful.

Table 143
USEFULNESS OF COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL/COMMISSION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total number of committees	127	100
Very useful	89	70
Somewhat useful	24	19
Only slightly useful	12	9
Not useful at all	2	2

Meetings of Council/Commission and Its Committees in Public Sessions

Public sessions of council/commission meetings are much more the rule than the exception. Most councils/commissions are required to have them, and the number in that group is rising. Even among those not so required, most do have them.

Table 144
WHETHER COUNCILS/COMMISSIONS ARE REQUIRED TO MEET IN PUBLIC SESSION

	Total Agencies			
	Fiscal 1974		Fiscal 1975	
	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	55	100
Required to meet in public session for all meetings	32	58	36	65
Required to meet in public session for some meetings	8	15	8	15
Not required to meet in public session at all	15	27	11	20

Of the 8 councils/commissions that were required to meet in public sessions for some meetings, the meetings included such types as those related to personnel, security, real estate and, for 1 council, grants. One council/commission must meet publicly only once a year.

Of the 11 councils/commissions not required to meet in public session at all in fiscal 1975, 8 nevertheless do meet publicly at least for some of their sessions.

Observation:

So-called "sunshine laws" have been enacted in a number of states during recent years that require greater public disclosure of governmental transactions, meetings, etc. These relate to many types of state agencies, of course, in addition to the arts agency, but as a result state arts councils/commissions are increasingly required to conduct their meetings in public.

Smaller committee meetings are, not surprisingly, far less likely to be subject to requirements pertaining to public sessions, with fewer than one-third of those councils/commissions with such committees subject to requirements for public sessions of all committee meetings.

Table 145
WHETHER COMMITTEES REQUIRED TO MEET IN PUBLIC SESSIONS
(Base: Councils/commissions that do meet in smaller committee sessions)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	33	100
Required to meet in public session for all committee meetings	10	30
Required to meet in public session for some committee meetings	2	6
Not required to meet in public session at all	20	61
Not sure	1	3

Of the 20 agencies in which committee meetings are not required to be public at all, 9 report that at least some committee meetings actually are held in public sessions.

Compensation to Members for Attendance at Meetings

In the discussion of meetings of the councils/commissions and their committees, the type of compensation, if any, made to members was explored. Although honoraria are relatively rare, in 80% of the agencies members are at least reimbursed for their expenses, while in 16% they receive neither reimbursement nor an honorarium.

Table 146
WHETHER COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS ARE COMPENSATED FOR ATTENDING MEETINGS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Members are reimbursed for expenses	39	71
Members are reimbursed for expenses and also receive honorarium	5	9
Members receive honorarium for attending meetings	1	2
Members receive neither reimbursement nor honorarium	9	16
Flexible policy	1	2

It is reasonable to conclude that unless members are at the very least reimbursed for their expenses in attending meetings, membership on councils/commissions will be much more likely to be restricted to an upper income level that can afford the costs involved in attendance. On the other hand, agencies with limited funds may find it difficult to provide reimbursement, particularly with the relatively frequent occurrence of meetings.

The expenditures of an agency are related to the compensation policy; the lower the total expenditures, the more likely that no compensation will be made most probably because funds are not available for this purpose in those agencies:

Table 147
WHETHER NO COMPENSATION IS MADE TO COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS
FOR ATTENDING MEETINGS, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Members receive honorarium or reimbursement, or both	45	82	9	60	17	85	10	100	9	90
Members receive neither	9	16	6	40	3	15	-	-	-	-
Flexible policy	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10

Chairman of the Council/Commission

In all state arts agencies the council or commission is headed by a chairman; in 29 agencies the chairmanship is an appointive position, and in the remaining 26 agencies the chairman is elected. In response to a question on who is most likely to suggest a person for chairman or to initiate the selection process, directors reported that suggestions for persons to serve as chairman are most likely to come from the council or commission itself; the governor was also cited as a source of suggestions or the initiator of the selection process in more than 2 in 5 states, and the executive director in one agency in four.

Table 148
MOST LIKELY PERSONS TO SUGGEST A PERSON FOR CHAIRMAN OR TO INITIATE THE SELECTION PROCESS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Council/commission	31	56
Governor	24	44
State arts agency executive director	14	25
Retiring chairman	2	4
Legislature	1	2

The actual naming or appointment is done by the governor in a majority of states; in one of those states in which the council or commission names or appoints the chairman the governor has the power of final review or approval, and the legislatures of five such states have this power.

Table 149
PERSONS WHO NAME OR APPOINT CHAIRMAN

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Governor	30	54
Council/commission	24	44
Both governor and council/commission	1	2

Table 150
POWER OF FINAL REVIEW OR APPROVAL OF SELECTION OF CHAIRMAN BY COUNCIL/COMMISSION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies in which council/commission names or appoints chairman	24	44
Legislature has power of final review or approval	5	9
Governor has power of final review or approval	1	2

The length of a chairman's term ranges from one year, the term in 1 in 3 agencies, to an unspecified number of years (in 42%).

Table 151
TERM WHICH CHAIRMAN SERVES

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Chairman serves specified term	32	58
1 year	18	33
2 years	5	9
3 years	3	5
4 years	5	9
More than 4 years	1	2
Chairman does not serve specified term	23	42

However, in 9 out of 10 of the agencies in which there is a specified term for the chairmanship, the chairman can serve two or more consecutive terms, and in only 1 of the remaining 3 can a chairman not serve two or more non-consecutive terms.

Table 152
WHETHER CHAIRMAN CAN SERVE MORE THAN ONE TERM
(Base: Agencies in which chairman serves specified term)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	32	100
Chairman may serve two or more consecutive terms	29	91
Chairman may serve two or more non-consecutive terms	2	6
Chairman may not serve more than one term	1	3

According to the directors, state arts agency chairmen serve as a liaison between the agency and the state governmental hierarch in most states, meeting personally with the governor in more than 4 in 5 states, with the legislature in 3 in 4 states, and with the governor's staff in 2 in 3 states.

Table 153
WHETHER CHAIRMAN PERSONALLY MEETS, AS A FUNCTION OF HIS OR HER CHAIRMANSHIP, WITH THE GOVERNOR ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE AGENCY, AND APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF TIMES SUCH MEETINGS WERE HELD IN FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Does meet with governor	47	85
Met in fiscal 1974:		
None	2	4
1 - 2 times	22	39
3 - 4 times	13	24
5 or more times	5	9
Not sure	5	9
(Average number of meetings, 3.1)		
Does not meet with governor	6	11
Not sure	2	4

Table 154
WHETHER CHAIRMAN PERSONALLY MEETS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT OR OTHER STAFF OF GOVERNOR'S OFFICE ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE AGENCY, AND APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF TIMES SUCH MEETINGS WERE HELD IN FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Does meet with governor's office staff	36	65
Met in fiscal 1974:		
1 - 2 times	11	19
3 - 4 times	8	15
5 or more times	9	16
Not sure	8	15
(Average number of meetings, 4.7)		
Does not meet with governor's office staff	19	35

Table 155
WHETHER CHAIRMAN PERSONALLY MEETS WITH INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE AGENCY, AND APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF TIMES SUCH MEETINGS WERE HELD IN FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Does meet with members of state legislature	41	75
Met in fiscal 1974:		
1 - 2 times	10	18
3 - 4 times	5	9
5 or more times	17	32
Not sure	9	16
(Average number of meetings, 9.4)		
Does not meet with members of state legislature	11	20
Not sure	3	5

The high proportion of agencies in which the chairman does meet personally with the governor and legislature is an indication that the opportunity for personal presentations of the needs of the agencies does exist widely. The existence of this personal bridge to the executive and legislative branches is likely to some extent a reflection of the fact that in a majority of states the chairman is selected by the governor and is therefore probably personally known to the governor. In the 6 states in which the chairman does not meet with the governor, the primary reasons given why this is so were that the governor does not wish to or is not interested (in 3 states), the chairman is not involved with the governor (2 states), and the chairman does not know the governor (1 state).

Directors of State Arts Agencies

Almost all state arts agencies have the position of a paid director, usually called the executive director. Only 2 states do not have a paid director; in one the position of director is unpaid and in the other (American Samoa) there is no position of director, with the chairman -- a member of the governor's staff -- handling all administrative matters. The director is largely chosen by the council or commission, but in one in five states the governor selects the director.

Table 156
PERSONS WHO SELECT OR APPOINT DIRECTOR
(Base: Agencies with paid or unpaid director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors	54	100
Council/commission	41	76
Governor	11	20
Another state agency	1	2
Council/commission chairman	1	2

A large majority of state arts agency directors are male, a majority are less than 45 years old, and most have gone beyond a bachelor's degree in education.

Table 157
CHARACTERISTICS OF DIRECTORS
(Base: Agencies with paid or unpaid director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors	54	100
Sex of director		
Male	35	65
Female	19	35
Age of director		
25 - 34 years	16	30
35 - 44 years	17	31
45 - 54 years	17	31
55 and over	4	8
Median age: 41.2 years		
Education of director		
High school graduate	1	2
College graduate	17	31
Additional higher education	10	19
Master's degree	23	42
Doctor's degree	3	6

Undergraduate degrees were earned by directors in a wide variety of fields, including such subjects as political science, history, education, psychology and business administration, as well as more arts-oriented subjects such as architecture, music and theatre. Master's degrees, however, were more likely to be arts-oriented, especially in the areas of literature, arts administration, visual arts and music.

Arts administration is a relatively new field of study for advanced degrees, but 4 directors did report having received a master's degree in arts administration.

Moreover, a majority of agency directors have taken arts management courses, and 2 in 3 had arts management experience before working with a state arts agency, with approximately the same proportion having non-arts management experience. All told, more than 9 in 10 directors have some type of management experience or education.

Table 158
ARTS AND NON-ARTS MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors	54	100
Director has management experience/education	51	93
Director has taken arts management courses, seminars or workshops	28	52
Director had previous arts management experience	36	67
Director had previous non-arts management experience	35	65

The previous arts management experience was primarily as a manager or director of an arts organization, with agency directors also reporting that they had been active in arts education, gallery work and as a council member. Non-arts management experience centered on education, municipal, social and recreational agencies, communications and non-profit organizations.

The length of experience within state arts agencies ranges from 5 directors with less than one year's experience to 2 with more than ten years' experience, a majority having five years' or more experience. The length of time in the current position of director, however, was more limited, with a majority being in the job three years or less.

Table 159
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN WORK IN STATE ARTS AGENCIES
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors	54	100
Less than 1 year	5	9
1 - 2 years	11	21
3 - 4 years	10	18
5 - 6 years	10	18
7 - 8 years	7	13
9 - 10 years	9	17
More than ten years	2	4

Median number of years: 5.5

Table 160
YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION AS DIRECTOR
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors	54	100
Less than 1 year	10	18
1 year	10	18
2 years	7	13
3 - 4 years	9	17
5 - 6 years	7	13
7 - 8 years	5	10
9 - 10 years	6	11

Median number of years: 2.5

State arts agency directors are generally a highly experienced group, with both arts and non-arts management backgrounds. Considering the relatively recent history of state arts agencies, their experience in such agencies is on the average not inconsiderable. However, 1 in 3 directors in the job one year or less indicates a high rate of turnover.

Almost 1 in 5 state arts agency directors are paid a salary of less than $15,000 a year, with less than 1 in 5 receiving a salary of $25,000 or over.

Table 161
SALARY OF DIRECTOR
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors	54	100
$10,000-14,999	10	19
$15,000-19,999	21	39
$20,000-24,999	13	24
$25,000-29,999	7	13
$30,000 and over	2	4
Median salary: $18,900		
Non-paid	1	2

The funds for the salaries of paid directors -- all of whom are full-time -- are derived from the regular agency budgets in all cases except one, where funds come from a combination of the regular agency budget and an associated foundation. In only 14 agencies -- or 26% of those with directors -- is the director's position a civil service or merit system job, and in only 5 -- 9% of those with directors — was the director required to pass an examination in order to assume the position.

The salaries of directors tend to increase with the size of the agency's budget, a not unexpected rise, in light of the greater responsibilities and administrative duties likely to accompany increase expenditures.

Table 162
MEDIAN SALARY OF DIRECTORS, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES OF AGENCY

	Expenditures			
Total Agencies	Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and Over
$18,900	$14,600	$17,700	$22,500	$25,000

Activities of Directors

When asked in an open-end question what they felt should be the major functions of their jobs, i.e., the most important of their responsibilities, directors were most likely to cite work with the council/commission and administration of the agency:

Table 163
WHAT DIRECTORS FEEL SHOULD BE MAJOR FUNCTIONS OF THEIR JOB*
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	54	100
Working with council/commission on policy, planning, etc.	45	83
Administration of agency	41	76
Development of resources	20	37
Promoting the arts to the public, increasing public appreciation	18	33
Contact with state agencies and other political bodies	18	33
Long-range planning	7	13
Hiring capable staff	3	6
Public relations	3	6
Informing arts community of policies and activities	3	6
Liaison with National Endowment for the Arts	3	6
Maintaining integrity of agency and staff during political unrest	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

To determine how directors actually do apportion their time, they were asked how much time they spend -- on a scale of "a great deal of time," "some time," "only a little time," and "do not do" -- on each of a list of 18 specific activities that directors may be involved in. (The list was drawn up by The National Research Center of the Arts, in cooperation with consultant directors and the National Endowment for the Arts.) Ranking the 18 activities according to the proportion of directors who spend a great deal of time on them, general administrative activities rank highest, with a majority of directors noting that they also spend a great deal of time in liaison with the council/commission, program and budget preparation, communication with the arts community and representing the agency. The 18 activities, and the number and percentage of directors who do them a great deal, are shown in the following table:

Table 164
ACTIVITIES ON WHICH DIRECTORS SPEND A GREAT DEAL OF TIME
(Base: Agencies with directors)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors	54	100
General administration for the proper functioning of the agency	47	87
Liaison with the council or commission	36	67
Preparing the program and budget of the agency	31	57
Engaging in long-term planning	22	41
Fulfilling various reporting requirements	21	39
Managing council-run projects	6	11
Communicating and cooperating with artists and the cultural community	28	52
Providing counseling to artists and cultural organizations in the state	23	43
Evaluating grant requests	18	33
Advising the arts community concerning the National Endowment for the Arts	10	19
Follow-up evaluations (of grant requests)	8	15
Representing the state arts agency before the public and community leadership	28	52
Communicating with and informing the legislature and governor or other state officials of activities of the agency	17	31
Advising the Endowment concerning the arts community	10	19
Serving on other boards or commissions, advisory groups, etc.	5	9
Obtaining funds in addition to those from the state legislature and National Endowment for the Arts	4	7
Directing programs/organizations other than this state agency (other than associated foundations)	1	2
Serving as officer or staff of an associated foundation	-	-

The grouping of activities on the tables into administrative tasks, liaison with the arts and cultural community, liaison with state and federal groups, and miscellaneous other activities indicates that although administrative tasks occupy a great deal of time among the largest proportions of directors, working with the arts community is a major activity of directors, as is work with the state public and private hierarchy.

When asked what other activities they were involved in, in addition to the 18 listed, directors cited such activities as contemplating programs (8 directors), regional arts activities (5), office work (5), coordinating advisory panels (4), serving on a National Endowment for the Arts panel (4), serving on an arts education task force (4), Alliance for Art Education (4), and such miscellaneous activities as those concerned with Bicentennial commissions, cultural centers, the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, etc.

A slight majority of directors feel that the amount of time spent on different types of activities will change in the near future, with the most likely changes volunteered by directors being in increased time on long-range planning, liaison with the legislature, and budget and fund raising activities.

Table 165

EXPECTATIONS OF CHANGES IN AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT BY DIRECTOR ON DIFFERENT TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*

(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	54	100
Amount of time will change	30	55
More involvement in long-range planning	13	24
More time spent on legislature	9	17
More time spent on budget/fund raising	7	13
Less involvement in programming	4	7
Less time on grant reviews	4	7
More time relating to community	3	6
Larger staff, less duties per individual	3	6
More time on programs	2	4
Increasing pressure to do more	2	4
More management, coordination, less personal contact	1	2
More time determining agency's role	1	2
Increase generally	1	2
Do not know	1	2
Amount of time not likely to change	23	43
Not sure	1	2

---

*List of changes comprises volunteered responses to an open-end question.

The director, like the chairman, plays an important role as a representative of the state arts agency to the state government. Although in Table 164 only 17 directors reported spending a great deal of time communicating with the legislature, governor and other state officials, a majority of directors do meet personally with the governor, members of the governor's staff, and/or members of the legislature.

Table 166

WHETHER DIRECTOR PERSONALLY MEETS WITH GOVERNOR ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE AGENCY, AND APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF TIMES SUCH MEETINGS WERE HELD IN FISCAL 1974

(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with director	54	100
Does meet with governor:	43	80
Met in fiscal 1974:		
None	5	9
1 - 2 times	13	24
3 - 4 times	13	24
5 or more times	9	17
Not sure	3	6
(Average number of meetings: 4.2)		
Does not meet with governor	11	20

Table 167

WHETHER DIRECTOR PERSONALLY MEETS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT OR OTHER STAFF OF GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, AND APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF TIMES SUCH MEETING WERE HELD IN FISCAL 1974

(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with director	54	100
Does meet with governor's office staff	48	89
Met in fiscal 1974:		
None	4	7
1 - 2 times	3	6
3 - 4 times	10	19
5 times or more	28	51
Not sure	3	6
(Average number of meetings: 9.9)		
Does not meet with governor's office staff	6	11

Table 168
WHETHER DIRECTOR PERSONALLY MEETS WITH INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE, AND APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF TIMES SUCH MEETINGS WERE HELD IN FISCAL 1974
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with director	54	100
Does meet with members of state legislature	48	89
Met in fiscal 1974:		
None	1	2
1 - 2 times	4	7
3 - 4 times	3	6
5 or more times	35	65
Not sure	5	9
(Average number of meetings: 13.9)		
Does not meet with members of state legislature	6	11

Of the 11 directors who do not meet with the governor, 8 reported that such meetings were not their responsibility but were someone else's job, 1 that members of the council/commission have more influence with the governor, 1 that it was not necessary, and 1 that the governor is not interested.

Although chairmen are somewhat more likely to meet with governors, directors who do meet with governors do so more frequently than chairmen; directors are also more likely to have personal contact with the governor's staff and members of the legislature:

Table 169
MEETINGS OF CHAIRMEN AND DIRECTORS WITH STATE HIERARCHY

	Chairmen		Directors	
	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	54	100
Meet with governor	47	85	43	80
Average meetings in fiscal 1974	3.1 meetings		4.2 meetings	
Meet with staff of governor	36	65	48	89
Average meetings in fiscal 1974	4.7 meetings		9.9 meetings	
Meet with members of legislature	41	75	48	89
Average meetings in fiscal 1974	9.4 meetings		13.9 meetings	

When asked what other channels they have to communicate with the governor, the governor's staff, or members of the legislature, directors mentioned intermediary persons, as well as the other means of communication shown in Table 170.

Table 170
OTHER CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION WITH GOVERNOR, GOVERNOR'S STAFF AND INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURE*
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with director	54	100
Friends, associates of governor	40	74
Legal counsel	1	2
Secretary of state	1	2
Member(s) of state judiciary	1	2
Member(s) of U.S. Congress	1	2
Chairman, vice chairman of council/ commission	1	2
Concerned Citizens for the Arts	1	2
Correspondence, mail	9	17
Telephone	6	11
Direct (non-specific)	6	11
Newspaper	3	6
Media	1	2
None/no other necessary	3	6

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

A slight majority of directors feel that trends or shifts will occur in their communications with the state hierarchy in the near future, with an emphasis on greater communication and involvement.

Table 171
WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN COMMUNICATION OF DIRECTOR WITH GOVERNOR AND STAFF AND INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF STATE LEGISLATURE ARE FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with director	54	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	29	54
No trends or shifts	24	44
Depends on who is governor (volunteered)	1	2

Table 172
TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN COMMUNICATION OF DIRECTOR WITH GOVERNOR AND STAFF AND INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF STATE LEGISLATURE FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*
(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors who foresee trends	29	54
More frequent communication	17	31
More personal involvement	6	11
More interest by state hierarchy in arts/budget increase	3	6
Council must improve governor's attitude	2	4
More ongoing contact	1	2
Different approach	1	2
Decreasing personal contact with governor	1	2
Council must improve legislature attitude	1	2
Do not know, too early to tell	1	2

---

*List of trends comprises volunteered answers to an open-end question.

In the inquiry into the relationship between the director and the state hierarchy, the directors were asked what other government officials, either administrative or legislative, are most critical, by nature of the office they hold, to the programs and activities of the agency; key budget people in both the legislative and executive branches were mentioned by almost half the directors.

Table 173

OTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS DIRECTORS FEEL ARE MOST CRITICAL TO THE STATE ARTS AGENCY*

(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with director	54	100
Legislative budget committee, chairman	25	46
Budget/auditing/treasury department	23	43
Administrative department officials	15	28
Legislative leadership	9	17
Educational department officials	8	15
Other legislative committees and/or chairmen	6	11
Secretary of state	4	7
Lieutenant governor	3	6
Tourism department officials	2	4
Attorney general	2	4
Community-related agency or department heads, e.g., cultural affairs, environmental, etc.	2	4
Comptroller	2	4
Federal legislature	1	2

---

*Volunteered answers to an open-end question.

In a last phase of the inquiry into relationships between directors and government officials, directors were asked whether they foresee any trends or shifts in which a government official or officials will be most critical in determining the level of appropriations or in frequency of contact in the near future, and again a majority foresee such trends.

Table 174

WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN WHICH GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL(S) WILL BE MOST CRITICAL IN DETERMINING LEVEL OF APPROPRIATIONS OR FREQUENCY OF CONTACT BY DIRECTOR WITH SUCH OFFICIALS ARE FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS

(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with director	54	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	31	57
No trends or shifts	23	43

Table 175

TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL(S)' DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF APPROPRIATIONS OR DIRECTOR'S CONTACT WITH THEM FORESEEN IN COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*

(Base: Agencies with director)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies with directors who foresee trends	31	57
More contact with officials	9	17
Increased appropriations	8	15
Increased pressure on governor, legislature/ stronger arts constituency	8	15
Greater emphasis on education by legislature	3	6
Stronger emphasis on local communities, less on large city institutions	3	6
More effective action by agency and/or department director	3	6
Shift in priorities by executive department to cultural programs	2	4
Redesign of agency by governor	2	4
Funding reduced/governor, legislature highly critical	2	4
Governor gaining power to veto agency budget	1	2
Increased staff	1	2
New budgeting system, similar to PPBS	1	2
Pressures of budget	1	2

---

*Volunteered answers to an open-end question.

Management Authority and Decision-Making Powers

The survey investigated the grant-making authorities of the chairman and of the executive direator -- as well as of combinations of persons in the agency -- and the involvement in and final responsibility for decisions by the chairman, the director and key persons within and without the agency.

In fiscal 1974 less than 1 in 5 chairmen had discretionary power -- that is, with the approval of no one else -- to make a grant to an individual or organization requesting funds, but 2 in 5 directors or other staff members did have such discretionary powers. Among those chairmen and directors who had discretionary grant-making powers, the median amount of an individual grant was the same, but the annual limit was higher for directors.

Table 176
DISCRETIONARY GRANT-MAKING POWERS IN FISCAL 1974

	Chairmen		Directors	
	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	54	100
Have discretionary power	9	17	22	41
Median maximum amount of single discretionary grant	$800		$800	
Median maximum total annual amount of discretionary grants	$6,300		$9,200	
No discretionary power	46	83	32	59

Interestingly, a larger proportion of chairmen of agencies in the lowest total expenditures group had discretionary grant-making powers, while a smaller proportion of directors of these agencies had such powers:

Table 177
DISCRETIONARY GRANT-MAKING POWERS IN FISCAL 1974, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

	Total		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total chairmen	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Have discretionary grant-making power	9	17	5	34	3	15	-	-	1	10
Median maximum amount of single discretionary grant	$800		$500		$1,000				$800	
Median maximum annual amount of discretionary grants	$6,300		$3,000		$7,500				$37,500	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total directors	54	100	14	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Have discretionary grant-making power	22	41	2	14	11	55	6	60	3	30
Median maximum amount of single discretionary grant	$800		$500		$800		$900		$800	
Median maximum annual amount of discretionary grants	$89,200		none		$8,800		$10,000		$5,000	

In addition to discretionary powers to make grants in general, the survey also explored the authority of the exeutive director or other staff to make discretionary grants within the agency's broad program areas approved by the council/commission, and in a bare majority of agencies the executive director or other staff did have the discretionary power in fiscal 1974 to fund individuals or organizations for services in the fulfillment of the agencies' programs.

Table 178

DISCRETIONARY GRANT-MAKING POWER WITHIN BROAD PROGRAM AREAS APPROVED BY COUNCIL/COMMISSION IN FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Director or other staff did have discretionary power within approved program areas	28	51
No discretionary power	26	47

In most agencies in which the director or staff had discretionary power to fund individuals or organizations in the fulfillment of approved programs, there was no maximum amount for such funding other than the total amount approved for the entire program, but in 39% of the agencies a maximum amount was set.

Table 179

MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR WHICH DIRECTOR OR OTHER STAFF HAD DISCRETIONARY POWER WITHIN BROAD PROGRAM AREAS APPROVED BY COUNCIL/COMMISSION

(Base: Agencies in which director or other staff had such power)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies in which director or other staff had discretionary grant-making power within program areas in fiscal 1974	28	100
Maximum amount existed Median maximum amount: $700	11	39
No maximum amount	17	61

In contrast to the limited discretionary grant-making powers of chairmen, a strong majority of almost nine in ten chairmen do have the power to appoint committees of the council or commission on their own.

Table 180
WHETHER CHAIRMAN HAS POWER TO APPOINT
COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL/COMMISSION

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Chairman has such power	48	87
Only council/commission can appoint committees	5	9
Done by governor	1	2
No such committees	1	2

Decision-making Powers

In probing further into decision-making powers, the survey broadened its invetigation to include -- in addition to the chairman and the director -- the governor, the legislature, the council/commission members, committees of the council/commission, staff members other than the director, panels of experts, other advisors or consultants, and the state budget or finance office, with opportunities provided for the citing of other persons. Six types of deliberations were listed, and for each the director was asked which of the persons or groups were involved in various stages of deliberations and who has the final responsibility for making decisions of that type. The types of deliberations were: overall policy and long-range planning; budget; formulation of guidelines and program planning; grants or project funding; follow-up evaluation; and administrative matters.

1. Overall policy and long-range planning. The council/commission members and the executive director are each involved in stages of deliberations concerning policy and long-range planning in more than 9 in 10 agencies, and the chairman and other staff members in a majority of agencies. Final responsibility for decisions in this area lies largely with the council/commission members, but the chairman at least shares this responsibility in 1 in 3 agencies and the executive director in approximately 3 in 10.

Table 181
RESPONSIBILITY FOR OVERALL POLICY AND LONG-RANGE PLANNING

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Involved in deliberations										
Council/commission members	52	95	15	100	18	90	9	90	10	100
Executive director	50	91	12	80	18	90	10	100	10	100
Council/commission chairman	46	84	11	73	17	85	8	80	10	100
Staff members other than director	37	67	7	47	14	70	9	90	7	70
Committees of the council/commission	25	45	4	27	8	40	7	70	6	60
Panels of experts	21	38	3	20	7	35	6	60	5	50
Other advisors or consultants	16	29	3	20	8	40	4	40	1	10
Governor	14	25	4	27	5	25	2	20	3	30
State budget or finance officer	12	22	5	33	4	20	2	20	1	10
Legislature	10	18	2	13	3	15	2	20	3	30
Director of department of which agency is a part	3	5	-	-	2	10	1	10	-	-
National Endowment for the Arts	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
Arts/cultural organizations	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	10	-	-
Final responsibility for decisions										
Council/commission members	36	65	8	53	12	60	8	80	8	80
Council/commission chairman	18	33	7	47	7	35	2	20	2	20
Executive director	16	29	5	33	8	40	2	26	1	10
Governor	5	9	4	27	1	5	-	-	-	-
Committees of the council/commission	4	7	1	7	2	10	-	-	1	10
Director of department of which agency is a part	2	4	-	-	2	10	-	-	-	-
Staff members other than director	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
Panels of experts	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
Legislature	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10

2. Budget. The executive director is most likely to be involved in budget deliberations, but the legislature and governor, along with council/commission members, are more likely to have final responsibility for decisions in this area.

Table 182
RESPONSIBILITY FOR BUDGET

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Involved in deliberations										
Executive director	50	91	13	87	18	90	10	100	9	90
Council/commission members	40	73	10	67	15	75	6	60	9	90
State budget or finance officer	38	69	11	73	15	75	6	60	6	60
Legislature	37	67	10	67	15	75	5	50	7	70
Council/commission chairman	37	67	9	60	14	70	5	50	9	90
Governor	34	62	9	60	14	70	5	50	6	60
Staff members other than director	34	62	8	53	14	70	6	60	6	60
Committees of the council/commission	19	35	3	20	5	25	5	50	6	60
Other advisors or consultants	7	13	2	13	2	10	2	20	1	10
Panels of experts	5	9	-	-	-	-	3	30	2	20
Director of department of which agency is a part	5	9	-	-	4	20	1	10	-	-
Final responsibility for decisions										
Legislature	20	36	8	53	6	30	2	20	4	40
Council/commission members	20	36	3	20	8	40	6	60	3	30
Governor	17	31	6	40	5	25	3	30	3	30
Council/commission chairman	15	27	3	20	7	35	1	10	4	40
Executive director	14	25	4	27	7	35	2	20	1	10
State budget or finance officer	6	11	2	13	3	15	1	10	-	-
Directors of department of which agency is a part	5	9	-	-	4	20	1	10	-	-
Committees of the council/commission	3	5	-	-	2	10	-	-	1	10

3. Formulation of guidelines and program planning. The formulation of guidelines and program planning is based on deliberations involving the director in more than 9 in 10 agencies, and council/commission members in more than 4 in 5, with other staff members and the chairman each being involved in a majority of agencies. Final responsibility is largely with the council/commission members and/or the director.

Table 183
RESPONSIBILITY FOR FORMULATION OF GUIDELINES AND PROGRAM PLANNING

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Involved in deliberations										
Executive director	52	95	12	80	20	100	10	100	10	100
Council/commission members	46	84	11	73	17	85	8	80	10	100
Staff members other than director	40	73	9	60	16	80	9	90	6	60
Council/commission chairman	35	64	10	67	13	65	5	50	7	70
Committees of the council/commission	21	38	5	33	5	25	6	60	5	50
Panels of experts	13	24	2	13	2	10	6	60	3	30
Other advisors or consultants	10	18	4	27	4	20	2	20	-	-
Governor	2	4	1	7	-	-	-	-	1	10
Legislature	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10
National Endowment for the Arts	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
Director of department of which agency is a part	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
Arts/cultural organizations	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	10	-	-
Final responsibility for decisions										
Council/commission members	34	62	9	60	11	55	7	70	7	70
Executive director	31	56	7	47	13	65	8	80	3	30
Council/commission chairman	16	29	6	40	6	30	2	20	2	20
Staff members other than director	9	16	2	13	3	15	2	20	2	20
Panels of experts	4	7	1	7	2	10	-	-	1	10
Committees of the council/commission	4	7	1	7	1	5	2	20	-	-
Governor	2	4	2	13	-	-	-	-	-	-
Director of department of which agency is a part	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-

4. Grants or project funding. Decisions in this area are made almost entirely within the agency, with little involvement from the rest of the state government.

Table 184
RESPONSIBILITY FOR GRANTS OR PROJECT FUNDING

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Involved in deliberations										
Council/commission members	48	87	12	80	18	90	9	90	9	90
Executive director	45	82	9	60	18	90	10	100	8	80
Council/commission chairman	38	69	9	66	14	70	6	60	9	90
Staff members other than director	36	65	6	40	15	75	8	80	7	70
Panels of experts	28	51	5	33	11	55	5	50	7	70
Committees of the council/commission	20	36	4	27	6	30	5	50	5	50
Other advisors or consultants	9	16	2	13	4	20	2	20	1	10
State budget or finance officer	5	9	1	7	3	15	-	-	1	10
Governor	3	5	2	13	-	-	-	-	1	10
Legislature	2	4	1	7	1	5	-	-	-	-
Director of department of which agency is a part	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
Final responsibility for decisions										
Council/commission members	44	80	10	67	16	80	9	90	9	90
Council/commission chairman	17	31	6	40	6	30	3	30	2	20
Executive director	14	25	3	20	8	40	3	30	-	-
Committees of the council/commission	5	9	2	13	2	10	-	-	1	10
Staff members other than director	5	9	2	13	1	5	1	10	1	10
Governor	3	5	3	20	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panels of experts	3	5	-	-	1	5	1	10	-	10
Director of department of which agency is a part	2	4	-	-	1	5	1	10	-	-

5. Follow-up evaluation. Evaluations -- which may range from on-site visits to a review of reports of grant recipients -- are largely a staff area with involvement in a majority of agencies only by directors and/or other staff.

Table 185
RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total										
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Involved in deliberations										
Staff members other than director	48	87	11	73	18	90	10	100	9	90
Executive director	45	82	11	73	18	90	10	100	6	60
Council/commission members	22	40	8	53	4	20	4	40	6	60
Council/commission chairman	13	24	7	47	1	5	2	20	3	30
Committees of the council/commission	11	20	3	20	4	20	2	20	2	20
Panels of experts	11	20	3	20	2	10	4	40	2	20
Other advisors or consultants	10	18	1	7	3	15	4	40	2	20
State budget or finance officer	4	7	1	7	2	10	-	-	1	10
Grantees	3	5	-	-	1	5	1	10	1	10
Another state agency	1	2	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Final responsibility for decisions										
Executive director	38	69	10	67	17	85	8	80	3	30
Staff members other than director	22	40	4	27	8	40	6	60	4	40
Council/commission members	12	22	4	27	3	15	-	-	5	50
Council/commission chairman	5	9	3	20	1	5	-	-	1	10
Committees of the council/commission	5	9	1	7	3	15	-	-	1	10
Other advisors or consultants	2	4	1	7	-	-	1	10	-	-
Governor	1	2	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panels of experts	1	2	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grantees	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10

6. Administrative matters. As noted in the discussion of the director's functions, administration of the agency is the most important of these functions, and this is reflected in the fact that in 95% of agencies the director is involved in deliberations on administrative matters (it should be remembered that in 1 agency there is no director), and in 3 out of 4 the director has final responsibility for decisions in this area.

Table 186
RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

	Total Agencies		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Above	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Involved in deliberations										
Executive director	52	95	12	80	20	100	10	100	10	100
Staff members other than director	36	65	9	60	14	70	7	70	60	60
Council/commission chairman	23	42	7	47	10	50	2	20	4	40
Council/commission members	16	29	5	33	7	35	3	30	1	10
Committees of the council/commission	11	20	1	7	4	20	3	30	3	30
State budget or finance officer	7	13	-	-	3	15	2	20	2	20
Governor	5	9	3	20	1	5	1	10	-	-
Director of department of which agency is a part	5	9	-	-	4	20	1	10	-	-
Other advisors or consultants	2	4	-	-	2	10	-	-	-	-
Legislature	1	2	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Final responsibility for decisions										
Executive director	41	75	11	73	15	75	9	90	6	50
Council/commission chairman	13	24	6	40	3	15	1	10	3	30
Governor	6	11	3	20	2	10	1	10	-	-
Council/commission members	6	11	1	7	3	15	1	10	1	10
Committees of the council/commission	6	11	1	7	3	15	-	-	2	20
Staff members other than director	5	9	1	7	3	15	-	-	1	10
Director of department of which agency is a part	3	5	-	-	3	15	-	-	-	-
Legislature	1	2	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
Panels of experts	1	2	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-

After a decision has been reached it can, in some states, be vetoed by officials or agencies outside the state arts agency. In 2 in 5 states outside officials have this power, with the governor most often being able to veto decisions.

Table 187
OUTSIDE OFFICIALS WITH VETO POWER OVER DECISIONS MADE BY STATE ARTS AGENCY

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total agencies in which outside official or agency does have veto power	22	40
Governor	13	24
State finance/budget/controller's office	7	13
Legislature	5	9
Director of department of which agency is a part	5	9
Executive department or council	2	4
National Endowment for the Arts	2	4
Attorney General's office	2	4
State programming office	2	4
Department of developmental services	1	2
Department of administration	1	2
State clearinghouse	1	2
Lieutenant governor	1	2

---

*List of officials comprises volunteered answers to an open-end question.

The members of the council/commission bear primary responsibilities for decisions concerning policy and long-range planning, guidelines and program planning, and grants or porject funding, and are second only to the legislature in the area of budget. Executive directors, however, are involved in decision-making in all areas in a strong majority of the agencies, and the director and staff have the major responsibility for evaluation and administrative matters. Furthermore, consultant directors indicate that decisions made by the council/commission are often an adoption of positions prepared by the director and staff.

Observation:

> The respective roles of the chairman and executive director seem to have not been clearly defined in a number of areas; indications are that their responsibilities may develop into those of a chief executive and chief operating officer, respectively, more clearly than at the present time.

CHAPTER VII

MANPOWER

MANPOWER

This chapter focuses on the manpower available to state arts agencies to effect their programs and other activities. The manpower comprises paid staff, outside advisors, and volunteers:

- paid staff: the basic personnel of the agency, including the director. The analysis of paid staff covers:
  - -- number and type of personnel, such as full-time or part-time, executive-professional or clerical, etc.
  - -- characteristics of personnel, i.e., sex and racial/ethnic distribution
  - -- salaries of staff
  - -- staffs of associated foundation, if any
  - -- organization of staff, by function or art form
  - -- adequacy of staff, in terms of number and of experience and training
  - -- adequacy of staff, in terms of salary, and comparison of salaries with other state agencies
  - -- payment of staff in whole or in part by funds from the National Endowment for the Arts
- outside advisors or consultants, including the existence of panels and the types of panels
- volunteers and their use by state arts agencies

Number of Paid Staff

The 55 state arts agencies were staffed by a total of 483 personnel at the close of fiscal 1974 -- including the director as well as consultants and contract personnel serving in a staff capacity -- or an average of 9 paid staff per agency. The size of paid staff, however, varied widely -- from none in American Samoa in fiscal 1974, 1 in Guam and 2 in Nevada, North Dakota and Wyoming, to 29 each in Michigan and Puerto Rico, 30 in Tennessee and 82 in New York.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 188

NUMBER OF PAID STAFF,
INCLUDING DIRECTOR AND CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACT PERSONNEL,
SERVING IN A STAFF CAPACITY AT CLOSE OF FISCAL 1974

	Total #	Full-Time #	Part-Time #
New York	82	80	2
Tennessee	30	27	3
Michigan	29	26	3
Puerto Rico	29	22	7
Connecticut	17	14	3
South Carolina	15	14	1
Minnesota	13	7	6
Rhode Island	12	7	5
Colorado	11	9	2
Pennsylvania	11	11	-
Texas	11	8	3
Illinois	10	10	-
Indiana	10	10	-
Maryland	10	6	4
California	9	9	-
Massachusetts	9	9	-
Mississippi	9	5	4
Ohio	9	9	-
Alabama	8	8	-
Arizona	8	6	2
New Jersey	7	6	1
Washington	7	7	-
Alaska	6	6	-
Kentucky	6	6	-
Maine	6	6	-
Oklahoma	6	6	-
West Virginia	6	5	1
Hawaii	5	4	1
Iowa	5	4	1
Louisiana	5	3	2
Missouri	5	5	-
New Mexico	5	4	1
North Carolina	5	5	-
Vermont	5	5	-
Virgin Islands	5	5	-
Georgia	4	4	-
Kansas	4	4	-
Nebraska	4	2	2
New Hampshire	4	4	-
Oregon	4	4	-
South Dakota	4	2	2
Arkansas	3	2	1
Delaware	3	2	1
District of Columbia	3	3	-
Florida	3	3	-
Montana	3	2	1
Utah	3	3	-
Virginia	3	3	-
Wisconsin	3	-	3
Idaho	2	2	-
Nevada	2	1	1
North Dakota	2	-	2
Wyoming	2	2	-
Guam	1	1	-
American Samoa	-	-	-
TOTAL	483	418	65

The size of an agency's staff is naturally related to the agency's expenditures, those agencies with greater expenditures logically requiring a larger staff. This is seen clearly in the sharp increase in the average number of paid personnal by budget category:

Table 189
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PAID STAFF AT CLOSE OF FISCAL 1974,
BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

	Total Agencies	Expenditures			
		Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and Above
	#	#	#	#	#
Average staff	9	3	6	12	20

Another significant factor affecting staff size is the administration by the agency of its own programs, such as agency-administered touring programs, museums, etc. For example, Tennessee and Puerto Rico have a large number of agency-administered programs, requiring larger numbers of staff members generally to conduct these programs.

Type of Personnel

Of the total 483 staff members, 87% were full-time* and 13% were part-time. Again, the size of an agency's expenditures was a significant factor, with part-time personnel constituting 30% of total staff in agencies in the under $250,000 expenditure group compared with only 7% of those with expenditures of $750,000 and above.

---

*Full-time was defined as a minimum of 35 hours a week on a regular basis, part-time as fewer than 35 hours a week on a regular basis or any number of hours for only a part of the year.

Approximately two in three (65%) staff members were classified by the agencies as executive or professional personnel and the remaining 35% as clerical personnel. Thirty-four percent of total paid staff were civil service employees, 20% were contract personnal and 46% neither civil service nor contract. Only a minimal number of paid staff (8%) were union members, with no union members on the staff of agencies with expenditures below $250,000 and only 1% in the $250,000-499,999 group, but 6% of staffs of agencies in the $500,000-749,999 group and 15% of those with expenditures of $750,000 and above.

Table 190
TYPE OF PERSONNEL
(Base: Paid staff at close of fiscal 1974)

		Expenditures			
	Total Agencies	Below $250,000	$250,000-$499,999	$500,000-$749,999	$750,000 and Above
	(483)	(44)	(123)	(120)	(196)
	%	%	%	%	%
Total paid staff at close of fiscal 1974	100	100	100	100	100
Full-time	87	70	86	82	93
Part-time	13	30	14	18	7
Executive/professional	65	59	65	65	66
Clerical	35	41	35	35	34
Civil service	34	34	40	24	35
Contract	20	27	24	20	16
Neither civil service nor contract	46	39	36	56	49
Union members	8	-	1	6	15
Non-union members	92	100	99	94	85

Differences in the type of personnel can be seen between executive-professional and clerical staffs, with a larger proportion of clerical personnel than executive-professional staff being under civil service and members of unions:

Table 191
TYPE OF PERSONNEL, BY EXECUTIVE-PROFESSIONAL VS. CLERICAL STAFF
(Base: Paid staff at close of fiscal 1974)

	Executive-Professional (314)	Clerical (169)
	%	%
Total paid staff at close of fiscal 1974 (483)	100	100
Full-time	86	87
Part-time	14	13
Civil service	29	41
Contract	25	12
Neither civil service nor contract	46	47
Union members	6	12
Non-union members	94	88

Characteristics of Paid Staff

Three out of every five paid staff members of state arts agencies are women. However, a majority (57%) of the executive-professional staff are men; in contrast, only 10% of the clerical staff are men.

The 83% of paid personnel who are white does not vary greatly by executive-professional vs. clerical classifications or full-time/part-time status, rising only to 84% of executive-professional staff and dropping to 79% of clerical staff. The proportion of black staff members, however, is somewhat higher among clerical staff (12%) than executive-professional (7%).

Table 192
CHARACTERISTICS OF PAID STAFF
(Base: Paid staff at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total (483)	Executive-Professional (314)	Clerical (169)	Full-Time (418)	Part-Time (65)
	%	%	%	%	%
Total paid staff at close of fiscal 1974	100	100	100	100	100
Sex					
Men	40	57	10	41	34
Women	60	43	90	59	66
Racial/ethnic group					
White	83	84	79	84	83
Black	9	7	12	9	2
Spanish-American	7	8	5	6	11
Oriental	1	1	2	1	2
American Indian	*	-	1	-	2
Other	*	-	1	*	-

---

*Less than 0.5%

Observation:

Although women constitute a majority of agencies' staffs, they are likely to occupy lesser positions than men, and this is reflected, as will be seen in the following section, in lower salaries paid them.

The 83% of paid staff who are white is actually below the proportion of whites among the population. In the 1970 census, 89% of the adult population 21 years and over were classified as white.

Salaries of Paid Staff

One in three (33%) staff members of state arts agencies received salaries of less than $7,500 at the close of fiscal 1974, and the median salary paid was $9,700. Excluding part-time workers, the median was a somewhat higher $10,500 for full-time staff, but still more than one in four (28%) were earning less than $7,500.

Executive-professional personnel earned a median $12,100, while clerical personnel were paid a median $6,600.

Table 193
SALARIES OF PAID STAFF
(Base: Paid staff at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total	Executive-Professional	Clerical	Full-Time	Part-Time
	(483)	(314)	(169)	(418)	(65)
	%	%	%	%	%
	100	100	100	100	100
Less than $5,000	10	8	12	1	68
$5,000-7,499	23	5	59	27	12
$7,500-9,999	18	18	21	19	15
$10,000-12,499	17	22	7	18	2
$12,500-14,499	14	21	1	16	3
$15,000-17,499	8	12	-	9	-
$17,500-19,999	4	6	-	4	-
$20,000-24,999	4	5	-	4	-
$25,000 and over	2	3	-	2	-
Median salary	$9,700	$12,100	$6,600	$10,500	$3,700

The $10,500 median salary paid to full-time staff members rose to $14,000 for male staff and dropped to only $8,400 for female staff. This sharp difference is explained in part by the much greater likelihood of women being in clerical positions. However, even among executive-professional personnel only, women were paid a lower median $10,000 compared with $13,800 for men:

391

Table 194
MEDIAN SALARY OF MEN AND WOMEN
(Base: Paid staff at close of fiscal 1974)

	Men $	Women $
Total	13,400	7,800
Executive-professional	13,800	10,000
Clerical	7,100	6,600
Full-time	14,000	8,400
Part-time	5,000	3,300

Observation:

The difference in median salaries between men and women is not a result of women in professional-executive positions being concentrated in smaller budget agencies, as might be conjectured. More than half the professional-executive women are in agencies with expenditures of $500,000 and over. However, women may be occupying lower level positions, although still within the executive-professional group, than male staff.

Staffs of Associated Foundations

The separate foundations associated with eleven* state arts agencies had paid staffs totaling only 17 at the close of fiscal 1974 (apart from the paid staff of the agencies themselves). Two of the states, Colorado and Nebraska, had no separate personnel for the associated foundation, and in only three states did the foundation's staff exceed one person -- Michigan (2), Connecticut (4) and New York (5).

---

*The foundation associated with the Massachusetts agency was not fully operative in fiscal 1974 and did not have paid staff.

Twelve of the 17 foundation personnel, or 71%, were in executive-professional positions, and the ratio of men to women was a close 9 men to 8 women.

Table 195
NUMBER OF PAID STAFF OF SEPARATE ASSOCIATED FOUNDATIONS
AT CLOSE OF FISCAL 1974

	Total #	Full-Time #	Part-Time #
Colorado	-	-	-
Connecticut	4	4	-
Florida	1	-	1
Illinois	1	1	-
Indiana	1	-	1
Michigan	2	1	1
Nebraska	-	-	-
New York	5	5	-
Oregon	1	1	-
South Carolina	1	-	1
Wyoming	1	-	1
TOTAL	17	12	5

Observation:

The small sizes of the staffs of separate associated foundations may indicate some restricted activities. However, indications are that, in some cases at least, the agency's own staff may be responsible for a large portion of the foundation's activities.

Table 196
TYPE OF PERSONNEL AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PAID STAFF OF SEPARATE ASSOCIATED FOUNDATIONS
(Base: Paid staff at close of fiscal 1974)

	Total Foundations %
Total paid staff at close of fiscal 1974 (17)	100
Executive-professional	71
Clerical	29
Full-time	71
Part-time	29
Civil service	6
Contract	41
Neither civil service nor contract	53
Union members	-
Non-union members	100
Sex	
Men	53
Women	47
Racial/ethnic group	
White	88
Black	6
Oriental	6

Organization of Staff of State Arts Agencies

The professional staff of the state arts agencies is most likely to be organized by function. When asked in an open-end question whether the organization or structure of the professional staff was by function (such as touring, technical assistance, etc.), by art form (such as music, etc.), or by some other division, 60% of the agencies reported functional organization, compared with only 7% organized by art form.

Table 197

ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF APART FROM DIRECTOR*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
By function	33	60
By art form/discipline	4	7
By program	1	2
By target audiences of population groups	1	2
By art form and function	4	7
By administration and program	2	4
By program and discipline	1	2
Small staff, jobs overlap	6	11
No other staff	3	5

---

*Volunteered answers to an open-end question.

Observation:

Professional staff of state arts agencies usually work more as administrative generalists in such areas as artists-in-schools, grants, public information, touring, etc., rather than as specialists in a particular discipline, regardless of what might be their special interests or background. Within many of the functional areas, of course, divisions by art form could be made, but few agencies have anywhere near the number of staff for such division of responsibilities. And, in fact, in most agencies the size of the staff is felt to be inadequate, as discussed below.

Adequacy of Staff

When asked whether the paid staff of the agency at the time of the survey was adequate in terms of current activities and responsibilities, in more than 4 in 5 agencies the staff was not considered to be adequate.

Table 198
ADEQUACY OF NUMBER OF STAFF
IN TERMS OF AGENCY'S CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Staff is not adequate in number	47	85
*Areas where staff is inadequate:		
Programs/programming	23	42
Secretarial/clerical	20	36
Administration	15	27
Community development	11	20
Fiscal affairs, accounting	9	16
Public relations	7	13
Evaluation	4	7
Specialists by art form	4	7
Grant officers	3	5
Touring	2	4
Artists-in-schools	2	4
Technical assistance	2	4
Curatorial	1	2
Youth consultant	1	2
All	3	5
Staff is adequate in number	8	15

---

*Volunteered answers to an open-end question.

Although agencies generally do not believe their staffs are large enough, most of them believe that those who are on the staff do have adequate experience or training.

Table 199
ADEQUACY OF EXPERIENCE OR TRAINING OF STAFF OF AGENCY

	Total Agencies #	%
Total	55	100
Staff does not have adequate experience or training	2	4
Some staff have adequate experience or training and some do not	8	15
*Areas where experience or training is not adequate:		
Budget control	3	5
Grantsmanship	3	5
Administration	3	5
Specific art background	2	4
Clerical	1	2
Technical assistance	1	2
All need more experience	3	5
All need more training	1	2
Staff has adequate experience or training	43	77
No other staff	2	4

---

*Volunteered answers to an open-end question.

Civil Service/merit Systems

In almost 2 in 3 agencies at least some staff members other than the director are under the state's civil service or merit system, with clerks, secretaries and administrative assistants most likely to be under such a system:

Table 200
WHETHER STAFF MEMBERS OTHER THAN DIRECTOR ARE UNDER STATE CIVIL SERVICE OR MERIT SYSTEM

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Some staff members under civil service or merit system	35	64
*Areas in which staff members are under civil service or merit system:		
Clerical/clerk-typist	11	20
Secretarial	10	18
Administration, administrative intern	10	18
Programming	8	15
Bookkeeping/accounting	3	5
Special projects	1	2
Finance	1	2
Executive assistant	1	2
Professional	1	2
Assistant director	1	2
Career employees	1	2
All/complete staff	10	18
No staff members under civil service or merit system	20	36

---

*Volunteered answers to an open-end question.

In most of the agencies in which staff positions are under civil service or merit systems, these positions must be filled in the order determined by the system;

Table 201
WHETHER CIVIL SERVICE/MERIT SYSTEM POSITIONS MUST BE FILLED IN ORDER DETERMINED BY THE SYSTEM

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total agencies with staff positions under civil service or merit system	35	64
All positions must be filled in system's order	23	43
Some positions must be filled in system's order	3	5
(Secretarial/clerical)	(2)	(3)
(Administrative)	(1)	(2)
No positions must be filled in system's order	9	16

Paralleling the high proportion of agencies with staff under state civil service or merit systems is the 83% of agencies in which at least some staff salaries are set by the state. For those positions for which the salaries are not set by the state, the council/commission most often has the power to establish salary levels:

Table 202
WHETHER SALARIES OF STAFF OTHER THAN DIRECTORS ARE SET BY THE STATE

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
All salaries are set by the state	38	68
Some salaries are set by the state and some not set by state	8	15
No salaries set by state	7	13
No other staff	2	4

Table 203
PERSONS WITH AUTHORITY TO SET NON-STATE REGULATED SALARIES

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total with some salaries not set by state or no salaries set by state	15	28
Council/commission	12	22
Executive director	2	4
Executive director and National Endowment for the Arts	1	2

Reflecting the fact that in most agencies salaries are set by the state, a majority of agencies report salaries generally on a par with equivalent positions of other agencies within the state, but more than one in three report salary levels below those of other state agencies:

Table 204
COMPARISON OF SALARY LEVELS IN STATE ARTS AGENCIES WITH THOSE OF OTHER AGENCIES IN THE STATE

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Salaries are on a par with other agencies within the state	29	52
Salaries are below other agencies	19	35
Salaries are above other state agencies	3	5
It varies (vol.)	1	2
Not sure (vol.)	1	2
No other staff (vol.)	2	4

However, despite the fact that 52% of agencies report salaries on a par with other state agencies, a higher 74% feel that current salary levels are not adequate to attract or keep needed personnel:

Table 205
ADEQUACY OF CURRENT SALARY LEVELS TO ATTRACT OR KEEP NEEDED PERSONNEL

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Salary levels are not adequate	41	74
*Areas in which salaries are inadequate:		
Programs	9	16
Administrative/management	5	9
Secretarial	4	7
Professional	3	5
Executive director	2	4
Administrative assistant	2	4
Public relations/public information	2	4
Community coordinator	1	2
All	23	42
Salary levels are adequate	11	20
It varies (vol.)	1	2
No other staff	2	4

---

*Volunteered answers to an open-end question.

Observation:

State arts agencies see salary levels as a problem in terms of recruiting and retaining qualified staff; nevertheless, they largely share this problem with other state agencies, since a majority report salaries on a par with these agencies. Raising salary levels is difficult in view of the limited funds available to the agencies as well as because of the fact that in most agencies authority for setting salaries is outside the agency itself. The next chapter indicates that higher salaries would be a priority if increased funds were available.

Salary Support from the National Endowment for the Arts

Problems related to the adequacy of salaries as well as the number of staff have to some extent been eased through salary support provided by the National Endowment for the Arts. Most agencies report that staff members and/or consultants or contract personnel serving staff-like functions were paid in whole or in part by funds from the National Endowment for the Arts in fiscal 1974 and in fiscal 1975, with the proportion rising from 76% in the former to 89% in the latter year:

Table 206
STAFF MEMBERS AND/OR CONSULTANTS OR CONTRACT PERSONNEL PERFORMING STAFF-LIKE FUNCTIONS PAID IN WHOLE OR IN PART BY FUNDS FROM THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Staff members and/or consultants or contract personnel were paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	42	76
No staff members and/or consultants or contract personnel were paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	13	24
Staff members paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	35	64
Average number in administrative areas: 1.0		
Average number in program areas: 1.3		
No staff members paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	20	36
Consultants or contract personnel were paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	29	53
Average number in administrative areas: 0.3		
Average number in program areas: 2.2		
No consultants or contract personnel were paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	26	47

Table 207
STAFF MEMBERS AND/OR CONSULTANTS OR CONTRACT PERSONNEL PERFORMING STAFF-LIKE FUNCTIONS PAID IN WHOLE OR IN PART BY FUNDS FROM THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, FISCAL 1975

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Staff members and/or consultants or contract personnel were paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	49	89
No staff members and/or consultants or contract personnel paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	6	11
Staff members paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	42	76
Average number in administrative areas: 0.9		
Average number in program areas: 2.2		
No staff members paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	13	24
Consultants or contract personnel were paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	32	58
Average number in administrative areas: 0.5		
Average number in program areas: 2.4		
No consultants or contract personnel were paid by funds from National Endowment for the Arts	23	42

The funds from the Endowment are primarily helping to pay for personnel in program areas, with an average, in agencies in which staff members were paid by Endowment funds in 1975, of less than one staff member in administration being paid by such funds but more than two in program areas. A similar situation prevails with regard to consultants/contract personnel. The Endowment, then, is a significant source of support for personnel as well as for program funds.

Outside Advisors or Consultants

In addition to staff members and staff-like consultants, most state arts agencies use the services of outside advisors or consultants in their activities. The most common role in which such advisors are used is that of serving on panels, and more than two in three agencies report having panels of experts (other than the council/commission and its committees).

Table 208
USE OF PANELS OF EXPERTS BY AGENCY

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Fiscal 1974:		
Did have panels of experts	37	67
No panels of experts	18	33
Fiscal 1975:		
Did have panels of experts	38	69
No panels of experts	17	31

Among those agencies not using panels in fiscal 1974, the reasons given included the fact that the director prefers not to deal with panels and finds them unnecessary (6 agencies), the lack of funds for panels including inability to reimburse for travel (6), the use of professional advisors instead (5), the fact that the state is too small (1), and the fact that no one ever suggested setting them up (1).

The use of panels is more widespread in the Northeast and North Central states than in the rest of the country, with only 1 agency in the Northeast and 2 in the North Central region not using panels in fiscal 1974:

Table 209
USE OF PANELS IN FISCAL 1974, BY REGION

	Total Agencies		Northeast		South		North Central		West	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	9	100	17	100	12	100	13	100
Did have panels	37	67	8	89	10	59	10	83	7	54
Did not have panels	18	33	1	11	7	41	2	17	6	46

Panels are most often organized by art form, but in many cases they are concerned with an overall program of the agency instead.

Table 210
NAMES OF PANELS AGENCIES HAD IN FISCAL 1974*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Total agencies with panels in fiscal 1974	37	67
Theatre/drama	24	44
Music/opera	23	42
Visual arts	23	42
Dance	23	42
Literature	22	40
Public media/communications	10	18
Artists-in-schools/education	10	18
Film	9	16
Architecture	7	13
Crafts/folk arts	6	11
Environmental design	5	9
Grants	4	7
Special projects	4	7
Awards	3	5
Humanities	3	5
Performing arts	2	4
Multi-arts/multi-media	2	4
Museum	2	4
Historical preservation	2	4
Community arts	2	4
Public relations	1	2
Personnel development	1	2
Auditions	1	2
Bicentennial	1	2
Policy	1	2
Budget	1	2
Business and the arts	1	2
Arts service organizations	1	2
Contemporary arts	1	2
Professional arts development	1	2
Coordinated arts	1	2
Youth arts	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Not surprisingly, in light of the organization of most panels by art form, a majority of panels function primarily in grant review, and only a small percentage exclusively in policy. In response to a question on the functions of panels, directors indicated that of the panels listed by agencies, 56% were in grant review, 8% in policy, and 31% were a combination of both, with the remaining 5% functioning in miscellaneous other areas.

Agencies also reported that panels were useful to the agencies in almost all cases, and a great majority of panels were described as very useful. Eighty-six percent of panels were evaluated as very useful in actual practice, and another 9% somewhat useful, with a minimal 3% only slightly useful and 2% not useful at all.

> Observation:
>
> The organization of panels primarily by art form contrasts with staff organization by function. Art form expertise seems to lie more with outside experts serving on panels, particularly in decisions on grant-making, while staff members are responsible for a wider range of functional duties in all aspects of programs.

Selection of Panel Members

In selecting members of panels, the executive director and the agency staff are most active in suggesting or initiating the selection process, but the final approval is usually left to the council/commission or chairman:

Table 211
SELECTION OF MEMBERS OF PANELS
(Base: Agencies that had panels in fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	37	100
Suggest or initiate selection of members		
Executive director	30	81
Members of agency's staff	21	57
Council/commission	15	41
Chairman of council/commission	14	38
Panel chairman	1	3
Other panelists	1	3
Final decision on appointment of members		
Council/commission	16	43
Chairman of council/commission	12	32
Executive director	10	27
Members of agency's staff	2	4

Not only are council/commission members responsible to a large extent for the appointment of members to panels, in most cases some members of the council/commission themselves serve on the panels. In 22 agencies (59% of the 37 agencies with panels) council/commission members do serve on panels, with an average of 5.7 council/commission members also being panel members in those agencies.

One reason given for not having panels, as noted earlier, was the inability to reimburse expenses of members. In most agencies panel members were at least reimbursed for expenses, but in 19% of the agencies they did not receive either reimbursement or an honorarium:

Table 212
WHETHER PANEL MEMBERS ARE COMPENSATED
(Base: Agencies that had panels in fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	37	100
Panel members are reimbursed for expenses	19	51
Panel members are reimbursed for expenses and also receive honorarium or fee	3	8
Panel members receive honorarium or fee	3	8
Panel members receive neither reimbursement nor honorarium	7	19
It varies (vol.)	5	14

A majority of agencies believe that trends or shifts in the use of panels will occur in the near future, and the direction of these trends is strongly toward greater participation by panels in the activities of the agencies:

Table 213
WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE USE OF PANELS ARE FORESEEN IN THE COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	36	65
More panels/panel members	15	27
Panel will have more active, wider role	12	22
Panels will have more influence in grants and programs	8	15
Increasing involvement of council/ commission members	3	5
May set up panel	2	4
Elimination of panels	2	4
Panels will become more formal	1	2
Panels used for selecting works of art	1	2
Panels used to prepare rosters of qualified artists	1	2
No trends or shifts foreseen	19	35

---

*List of trends foreseen comprise volunteered answers to an open-end question.

In addition to the panels of experts, a majority of state arts agencies also use other outside advisors and consultants, particularly as a source of professional expertise in policy and program planning:

Table 214
USE OF OTHER OUTSIDE ADVISORS OR CONSULTANTS IN FISCAL 1974

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Used outside advisors or consultants	35	64
Purposes for which advisors or consultants were used:*		
Professional guidance in programs and policy	26	47
Fund raising, budget assistance	5	9
Judging	4	7
Community arts development	4	7
Public relations	1	2
Visual arts	1	2
Research	1	2
Program planning	1	2
Evaluation	1	2
Design and construction of arts center	1	2
Restoration and archeological projects	1	2
Scholarship selection	1	2
Selection of artists-in-schools	1	2
Did not use outside advisors or consultants	20	36

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

The use of outside advisors or consultants rather than staff members is sometimes a result of state restrictions that make it impossible for the agency to hire sufficient staff or to obtain sufficiently qualified staff. Of the 35 agencies using outside advisors or consultants, 26, or 74%, reported in response to another question that they sometimes find it necessary to hire consultants or contractual personnel to fulfill staff functions because of the restrictions of state regulations.

The executive director and agency staff are not only most likely to suggest or initiate the selection of outside advisors or consultants, as with panel members, but the director also most often makes the final decision on the selection of such advisors.

Table 215
SELECTION OF OUTSIDE ADVISORS OR CONSULTANTS
(Base: Agencies that had outside advisors or consultants in fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	35	100
Suggest or initiate selection of advisors or consultants		
Executive director	30	86
Members of agency's staff	15	43
Chairman of council/commission	7	20
Council/commission	5	14
Elected state officials	1	3
Final decision on selection of advisors or consultants		
Executive director	24	69
Council/commission	7	20
Chairman of council/commission	5	14
Members of agency's staff	3	9
Elected state officials	1	3

Outside advisors and consultants are likely both to receive an honorarium or fee and to be reimbursed for expenses, but in 6 agencies (17% of those with consultants) they receive neither:

Table 216
COMPENSATION OF OUTSIDE ADVISORS OR CONSULTANTS
(Base: Agencies that had outside advisors or consultants in fiscal 1974)

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	35	100
Advisors and consultants are both offered honorarium or fee and reimbursed for expenses	15	44
Advisors and consultants are offered honorarium or fee	6	17
Advisors and consultants are reimbursed for expenses	4	11
Advisors and consultants receive neither reimbursement nor honorarium or fee	6	17
It varies (volunteered)	4	11

In a final aspect of the investigation of the manpower of state arts agencies, the use of volunteers generally -- apart from the council/commission -- was explored. A majority of agencies report they do not use volunteers and only 15% that they use volunteers on a regular basis:

Table 217
USE OF VOLUNTEERS OTHER THAN COUNCIL/COMMISSION MEMBERS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Agency regularly uses volunteers	8	15
Agency uses volunteers at times	15	27
Agency does not use volunteers	32	58

Those agencies that do use volunteers reported a wide variety of types of work done by the volunteers, particularly office and clerical work (in 7 agencies), special projects (5 agencies), evaluation (3), and staff conferences and workshops (3).

Although a minority of agencies do use volunteers, some of those that do so report a large number of volunteers involved in agency activities in fiscal 1974. Eleven agencies had more than 20 volunteers each active during the year, and the average number of volunteers per agency using them was 32.6; the median, however, was a lower 15.5, because of a large number of volunteers (more than 50) reported by a small number (7) of agencies.

CHAPTER VIII

PAST DEVELOPMENTS AND FUTURE OUTLOOK

PAST DEVELOPMENTS AND FUTURE OUTLOOK

This final chapter reviews the growth of the state arts agency movement since the 1960's and looks forward to the perceived directions of change in the future. In the analysis of growth during the past years, the chapter focuses on state appropriations and on total funds:

- state appropriations, funds appropriated by states to the state arts agencies in fiscal years 1966 through 1976, the changes in appropriations and the per capita amount of appropriations.
- total funds, funds received by state arts agencies from all sources in fiscal years 1971 through 1976, changes in amount of total funds, and per capita amount of total funds.

The perceived adequacy of total funding is then covered, and the expected trends in the level of funding. The existence of future plans and goals is detailed, and the effects of possible increases in fundings analyzed from two viewpoints:

- the perceived direction of programming with possible increases in the basic state agency grants
- areas in which funds would be spent, on a short-term and long-term basis, if sufficient funds were available.

State Appropriations

Funds appropriated to state arts agencies by the state legislatures have grown steadily during the past decade. In fiscal 1966, state appropriations to arts agencies totaled only \$2,664,640 (\$1,898,745 excluding New York State), while in fiscal 1975 appropriations had increased to \$57,189,285 (\$21,536,285 excluding New York).

In the five-year period between fiscal 1970 and fiscal 1975, state appropriations increased 646% over the fiscal 1970 appropriations of \$7,561,912, or an annual growth rate of 49%. However, a major factor in this increase was the dramatic jump in New York State appropriations of 1,480% over the fiscal 1970 appropriation of \$2,256,474 to \$35,653,000 in fiscal 1975. Excluding New York State from the calculations, though, the rise in state appropriations to state arts agencies has still been a significant one, with appropriations in fiscal 1975 amounting to 300% more than the fiscal 1970 appropriations of \$5,305,438, or an annual growth rate of 32%.*

In that five-year period growth rates of state appropriations varied widely by state, some states recording dramatically large increases, others very low, ranging from an actual decrease of 5% in Delaware to an increase above 1,000% in five states -- New Jersey (up 1,003%), Michigan (up 1,386%), New York (up 1,480%), Massachusetts (up 1,500%), and Virginia (up 2,621%). It should be noted that many large increases were based on severely low initial levels in 1970.

---

*The fiscal 1970 appropriations to American Samoa and Louisiana are not included in the percentage comparisons because comparable data for fiscal 1975 were not available.

In the one-year period between fiscal 1974 and fiscal 1975 state legislative appropriations rose 51% (excluding New York) over the fiscal 1974 total appropriations of $14,311,494, a greater increase than the five-year annual growth rate of 32%. However, in six states appropriations dropped during the one-year period (the drop was less than 10% except in Georgia, down 29%, and Alaska, down 31%), continuing the somewhat erratic pattern.

The state appropriations for fiscal 1976 continue the upward trend, but at a lower rate of increase. State arts agencies appropriations for fiscal 1976 totaled $61,416,405, or $25,713,505 excluding New York State, an increase of 19% (excluding New York) over 1975. (States that receive biennial appropriations that cover fiscal 1975 and fiscal 1976 would naturally not have received any substantial increase for the second year.)

The commitment by states to support of arts agencies has been matched by an increasing commitment by the federal government to the state arts agencies. The basic state agency grant of the National Endowment for the Arts rose during the five-year period from $36,363 per state in fiscal 1970 to $75,377 in fiscal 1971, $101,320 in fiscal 1972, $127,250 in fiscal 1973, $150,000 in fiscal 1974, and $200,000 in fiscal 1975, an overall rise of 450% -- or an annual growth rate over the period of 41% -- and a rise between fiscal 1974 and 1975 of 33%.

Data are unfortunately not available for the entire period on private funds received by the agencies, but indications are that private funds, through relatively modest, have also risen. In fiscal 1971, dollar amounts received from private sources totaled approximately $340,000, and in fiscal 1974 private funds reached $750,115, a rise of 147% in just a three-year period.

Observation:

The sharp increases in state appropriations during the past decade to the arts agencies reflect the increasing commitment by governors and state legislatures to support of the arts, a commitment that ten years ago was practically non-existent in all but a handful of states.

This commitment by states to support of the arts agencies has been matched by an increasing commitment by the federal government to the state arts agencies. The basic state agency grant of the National Endowment for the Arts rose during the five-year period from $36,363 per state in fiscal 1970 to $75,377 in fiscal 1971, $101,320 in fiscal 1972, $127,250 in fiscal 1973, $150,000 in fiscal 1974, and $200,000 in fiscal 1975, an overall rise of 450%, or an annual growth rate over the priod of 41% and a rise between fiscal 1974 and 1975 of 33%.

Unfortunately, data are not available for the entire period on private funds received by the agencies, but indications are that private funds, though relatively modest, have also risen. In fiscal 1971, dollar amounts received from private sources totaled approximately $304,000, and in fiscal 1974 private funds reached $750,115, a rise of 147% in just a three-year period.

Table 218

STATE LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL 1966-1976

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Change	
												5-Yr. 1970 -75	1-Yr. 1974 -75
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	%	%
Alabama	-	-	50,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	250,000 1/	+25	-
Alaska	-	18,835	47,500	47,500	47,600	100,000	69,400	88,500	149,600	103,800	126,100	+118	-31
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2/	60,000	2/	2/	6/	5/
Arizona	-	-	-	-	23,561	24,593	27,805	51,469	68,700	82,500	86,700	+250	+20
Arkansas	-	20,694	35,714	35,963	-	-	-	-	166,727	167,465	264,215	5/	+*
California	152,000	161,920	145,698	168,000	170,997	168,000	168,000	209,818	1,034,763	1,012,585	1,400,000 1/	+492	-2
Colorado	-	15,000	25,000	25,750	26,489	26,929	71,560	71,873	120,963	1,324,845	1,543,386	+490	+995
Connecticut	21,500	21,500	58,268	76,732	114,800	127,634	119,341	130,000	351,500	394,326	836,325	+243	+12
Delaware	-	-	-	-	45,454	50,000	35,000	37,721	42,600	43,128	58,850	-5	+1
District of Columbia	-	70,100	70,100	20,000	25,661	20,800	30,000	30,000	52,000	87,400	87,400	+241	+68
Florida	10,000	9,112	18,233	-	5,000	76,402	53,358	67,386	289,895	392,773	425,456	+776	+35
Georgia	27,300	30,400	60,000	48,516	88,060	102,960	99,279	70,000	220,000	157,105	155,846	+78	-29
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,579	10,000	10,218	28,192	17,314	6/	+176
Hawaii	2,500	90,000	123,500	118,945	163,579	174,558	152,765	131,876	221,307	223,689	538,964	+37	+1
Idaho	-	-	-	10,000	10,000	10,000	8,373	9,810	10,000	23,121	43,200	+131	+131
Illinois	25,000	25,000	100,000	100,000	250,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	925,000	1,278,000	+270	+54
Indiana	12,500	12,500	-	-	25,000	25,000	40,123	48,890	170,005	157,053	617,221	+528	-8
Iowa	-	-	25,000	25,000	30,730	32,644	38,188	38,465	52,244	70,767	200,730	+130	+35
Kansas	3,000	7,600	65,000	67,949	66,023	61,445	34,621	39,008	45,634	82,878	105,385	+26	+82
Kentucky	7,500	100,000	100,000	118,515	134,980	147,860	149,660	166,170	153,930	225,800	290,400	+67	+47
Louisiana	-	25,000	25,000	34,980	27,860	42,883	2/	2/	44,000	2/	2/	5/	5/
Maine	1,000	10,000	60,000	60,000	79,500	90,526	92,969	92,618	162,000	163,000	156,241	+105	+1
Maryland	-	50,053	50,000	260,000	275,505	347,763	319,818	399,725	453,411	449,788	451,500	+63	-1
Massachusetts	-	25,000	55,000	100,000	100,000	160,000	184,550	277,588	600,000	1,600,000	1,000,000	+1500	+167
Michigan	5,000	100,000	100,000	109,000	140,000	219,952	233,410	250,739	485,800	2,079,906	2,276,150	+139	+328
Minnesota	5,000	5,000	85,000	85,000	112,500	115,150	160,000	200,000	300,000	300,000	500,000	+167	-
Mississippi	-	-	-	-	-	75,000	73,366	74,763	107,668	112,628	160,564	6/	+5
Montana	-	-	12,500	12,500	25,000	25,000	25,000	28,114	27,550	30.588	75,049	+22	+11
Missouri	170,000	199,975	221,917	253,000	192,795	201,082	215,936	607,693	654,020	1,249,209	1,499,600	+550	+21
Nebraska	-	20,500	12,500	12,500	12,492	13,673	24,626	25,620	35,122	129,390	172,518	+936	+268
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,122	18,331	65,186	6/	+21
New Hampshire	-	-	7,500	7,500	10,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	45,679	48,559	59,356	+386	+6
New Jersey	7,500	75,000	75,000	64,929	71,658	226,059	268,059	271,577	698,932	790,352	671,000	+1003	+13
New Mexico	15,000	36,500	15,000	20,000	20,000	21,000	20,800	35,200	45,300	65,000	83,500	+225	+43
New York	765,895	1,504,477	1,897,585	2,491,861	2,256,474	20,133,193	14,423,000	16,325,000	16,445,000	35,653,000	35,702,900	+1480	+117
North Carolina	-	-	70,106	71,299	90,007	115,674	166,431	196,929	221,231	226,409	248,761	+152	+2
North Dakota	-	-	-	-	-	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	33,850	5/	-
Ohio	-	12,503	39,356	39,598	223,407	198,184	177,715	317,847	849,847	982,933	981,990	+340	+16
Oklahoma	10,000	11,500	35,000	35,000	65,733	36,399	36,399	81,011	95,100	95,322	120,322	+45	+*
Oregon	-	-	-	23,359	24,924	24,924	25,430	28,360	54,563	54,563	157,451	+119	-
Pennsylvania	-	40,000	137,473	198,205	204,000	205,000	205,000	236,000	758,000	1,490,000	1,490,000	+630	+97
Puerto Rico	915,300	1,043,700	1,263,300	1,352,200	1,491,263	1,631,000	2,357,200	2,364,351	2,753,267	3,239,567	3,275,197	+117	+18
Rhode Island	-	20,000	62,000	99,000	105,790	111,339	75,212	92,064	126,231	227,199	261,056	+115	+80
South Carolina	-	-	65,000	99,354	131,788	126,076	135,911	195,558	360,896	597,696	599,262	+354	+66
South Dakota	-	-	-	18,000	18,720	19,864	29,250	29,751	61,702	85,391	100,000	+356	+38
Tennessee	-	1,500	50,000	50,000	68,700	67,752	161,727	226,700	312,500	411,500	380,400	+499	+32
Texas	-	-	80,693	82,000	105,724	106,072	149,460	152,776	157,345	159,565	410,454	+51	+1
Utah	20,000	29,000	51,795	52,823	83,000	83,000	75,000	100,000	104,026	282,000	324,800	+240	+171
Vermont	500	500	26,500	27,300	28,800	35,459	40,061	41,700	52,626	50,000	50,000	+74	-5
Virgin Islands	-	10,000	50,000	140,000	160,000	150,000	160,000	160,000	160,000	100,000	100,000	+25	+25
Virginia	478,445 3/	1,002,060 3/	1,166,333 3/	10,000	10,000	140,000	138,152	174,130	201,705	272,055	272,055	+2621	+35
Washington	7,500	7,500	35,920	37,735	80,998	91,473	59,124	64,027	98,415	246,130	980,991	+204	+150
West Virginia	2,000	33,900	59,000	80,100	117,205	124,960	176,389	184,746	263,580	275,000	300,000	+135	+4
Wisconsin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42,227	59,000	102,200	6/	+40
Wyoming	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,822	9,465	12,543	12,577	27,560	6/	+*
Total	2,664,640	4,850,879	6,734,091	6,845,613	7,661,912	26,905,782	21,829,875	25,187,338	30,756,494	57,189,285	61,412,056	+648 4/	+86 4/
Total Without New York	1,898,745	3,346,402	4,836,506	4,353,752	5,405,438	6,772,589	7,406,875	8,862,338	14,311,494	21,536,785	25,713,505	+300 4/	+51 4/

---

* Less than 0.5%.

1/ Estimated or requested.

2/ Information not supplied.

3/ The Virginia State Museum was off the official state arts agency in fiscal 1966-1968.

4/ Does not include American Samoa and Louisiana.

5/ Comparative data not available.

6/ No state appropriations in fiscal 1970.

Change in State Appropriations Per Capita

The rise in state appropriations can also be seen clearly when total appropriations are translated into per capita figures. Total state appropriations of $7,761,912 in fiscal 1970 represented 3.7 cents per person in the national population (including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Guam), with a per capita amount of 2.9 cents excluding New York State. The appropriations per capita rose to 27.2 cents per capita in fiscal 1975, or 11.2 cents not including New York State.

The agency with the largest per capita appropriation, $2.22 in fiscal 1975, was the Virgin Islands Council on the Arts, followed by New York State with a per capita appropriation of $2.02. At the lower end of the scale, the Wisconsin and Texas agencies received appropriations amounting to only 1.3 cents per capita and the North Dakota agency only 0.8 cents per capita.

The per capita rankings of state appropriations changed greatly for many states between fiscal 1970 and fiscal 1975, with five states rising sharply during that period. New Jersey, which ranked 40th with a per capita appropriation of 1.0 cents in fiscal 1970, rose to 21st in fiscal 1975 with a per capita of 10.8 cents; Michigan rose from 33rd (1.6 cents) in fiscal 1970 to 12th (22.9 cents) in fiscal 1975; Pennsylvania from 32nd (1.7 cents) to 17th (12.6 cents); Massachusetts from 29th (1.8 cents) to 6th (27.6 cents); and Colorado,* with the sharpest rise, from 37th (1.2 cents) to 4th (53.1 cents).

---

*The sharp rise in Colorado was largely accounted for by funds earmarked for Denver arts and cultural organizations.

Table 219

STATE APPROPRIATIONS PER CAPITA[1/], WITH RANKINGS, FISCAL 1970 - 1975

	1970 $ (Rank)	1971 $ (Rank)	1972 $ (Rank)	1973 $ (Rank)	1974 $ (Rank)	1975 $ (Rank)
Alabama	.029 (20)	.029 (25)	.036 (24)	.035 (27)	.035 (40)	.035 (42)
Alaska	.158 (4)	.331 (4)	.230 (4)	.263 (4)	.444 (5)	.308 (5)
American Samoa	- (48)	- (50)	- (51)	-[2/]	2.069 (1)	-[2/]
Arizona	.013 (36)	.014 (37)	.016 (41)	.024 (36)	.032 (43)	.038 (40)
Arkansas	- (48)	- (50)	- (51)	- (51)	.081 (20)	.081 (27)
California	.009 (41)	.008 (47)	.008 (47)	.010 (47)	.049 (30)	.048 (36)
Colorado	.012 (37)	.012 (41)	.032 (29)	.029 (33)	.048 (31)	.531 (4)
Connecticut	.038 (16)	.042 (17)	.039 (22)	.042 (22)	.114 (12)	.128 (16)
Delaware	.083 (7)	.091 (7)	.063 (13)	.066 (15)	.074 (24)	.075 (29)
District of Columbia	.034 (18)	.028 (26)	.040 (21)	.041 (23)	.072 (25)	.121 (19)
Florida	* (47)	.011 (44)	.008 (47)	.008 (49)	.036 (39)	.049 (35)
Georgia	.019 (28)	.022 (32)	.021 (34)	.014 (42)	.045 (34)	.032 (45)
Guam	- (48)	- (50)	.080 (10)	.095 (9)	.097 (16)	.268 (7)
Hawaii	.212 (3)	.227 (5)	.198 (5)	.156 (5)	.261 (6)	.264 (8)
Idaho	.014 (34)	.014 (37)	.012 (45)	.012 (46)	.013 (51)	.029 (47)
Illinois	.022 (25)	.054 (13)	.054 (14)	.054 (17)	.054 (28)	.083 (26)
Indiana	.005 (45)	.005 (49)	.008 (47)	.009 (48)	.032 (43)	.029 (47)
Iowa	.011 (39)	.014 (37)	.014 (43)	.013 (43)	.018 (50)	.024 (49)
Kansas	.029 (20)	.027 (28)	.015 (42)	.017 (40)	.020 (49)	.037 (41)
Kentucky	.042 (14)	.046 (15)	.047 (16)	.049 (19)	.046 (32)	.067 (31)
Louisiana	.008 (43)	.012 (41)	-[2/]	-[2/]	.012 (53)	-[2/]
Maine	.080 (8)	.091 (7)	.093 (7)	.088 (11)	.155 (7)	.156 (14)
Maryland	.070 (10)	.088 (9)	.082 (9)	.098 (8)	.111 (14)	.110 (20)
Massachusetts	.018 (29)	.028 (26)	.032 (29)	.048 (20)	.103 (15)	.276 (6)
Michigan	.016 (33)	.025 (28)	.026 (33)	.028 (34)	.053 (29)	.229 (12)
Minnesota	.030 (19)	.030 (22)	.042 (19)	.051 (18)	.077 (22)	.077 (28)
Mississippi	- (48)	.034 (19)	.033 (27)	.032 (29)	.046 (32)	.048 (36)
Missouri	.041 (15)	.043 (16)	.046 (17)	.127 (6)	.137 (9)	.262 (9)
Montana	.036 (17)	.036 (18)	.036 (24)	.038 (24)	.037 (38)	.042 (38)

(Continued)

Table 219
STATE APPROPRIATIONS PER CAPITA, WITH RANKINGS, FISCAL 1970-1975
(continued)

	1970		1971		1972		1973		1974		1975	
	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)
Nebraska	.008	(43)	.009	(46)	.017	(37)	.017	(40)	.023	(48)	.084	(25)
Nevada	-	(48)	-	(50)	-	(51)	-	(51)	.026	(46)	.032	(45)
New Hampshire	.014	(34)	.013	(40)	.020	(36)	.019	(38)	.057	(27)	.060	(32)
New Jersey	.010	(40)	.032	(21)	.037	(23)	.037	(25)	.095	(17)	.108	(21)
New Mexico	.020	(27)	.021	(33)	.021	(34)	.031	(31)	.040	(37)	.058	(33)
New York	.124	(5)	1.107	(2)	.793	(2)	.901	(2)	.908	(3)	2.024	(2)
North Carolina	.018	(29)	.023	(31)	.033	(27)	.037	(25)	.041	(35)	.042	(38)
North Dakota	-	(48)	.008	(47)	.008	(47)	.008	(49)	.008	(55)	.008	(53)
Ohio	.021	(26)	.019	(34)	.017	(37)	.030	(32)	.079	(21)	.092	(24)
Oklahoma	.026	(23)	.034	(19)	.034	(26)	.032	(29)	.035	(40)	.035	(42)
Oregon	.012	(37)	.012	(41)	.012	(45)	.013	(43)	.024	(47)	.024	(49)
Pennsylvania	.017	(32)	.018	(35)	.017	(37)	.020	(37)	.064	(26)	.126	(17)
Puerto Rico	.550	(2)	.620	(3)	.762	(3)	.779	(3)	.907	(4)	1.067	(3)
Rhode Island	.111	(6)	.118	(6)	.079	(11)	.088	(11)	.135	(10)	.242	(10)
South Carolina	.051	(13)	.049	(14)	.053	(15)	.070	(14)	.130	(11)	.215	(13)
South Dakota	.028	(22)	.030	(22)	.044	(18)	.044	(21)	.090	(18)	.125	(18)
Tennessee	.018	(29)	.017	(36)	.041	(20)	.055	(16)	.076	(23)	.100	(23)
Texas	.009	(41)	.010	(45)	.013	(44)	.013	(43)	.013	(51)	.013	(51)
Utah	.078	(9)	.078	(11)	.072	(12)	.085	(13)	.089	(19)	.240	(11)
Vermont	.065	(12)	.080	(10)	.090	(8)	.089	(10)	.112	(13)	.106	(22)
Virgin Islands	2.532	(1)	2.373	(1)	2.532	(1)	1.778	(1)	1.778	(2)	2.222	(1)
Virginia	.002	(46)	.030	(22)	.030	(31)	.035	(27)	.041	(35)	.055	(34)
Washington	.024	(24)	.027	(28)	.017	(37)	.018	(39)	.028	(45)	.071	(30)
West Virginia	.067	(11)	.072	(12)	.101	(6)	.103	(7)	.147	(8)	.154	(15)
Wisconsin	-	(48)	-	(50)	-	(51)	-	(51)	.009	(54)	.013	(51)
Wyoming	-	(48)	-	(50)	.030	(31)	.026	(35)	.035	(40)	.035	(42)
TOTAL	.037		.131		.108[1]		.124[4]		.143		.272[4]	
Total without New York	.029		.036		.040[3]		.048[4]		.073		.112[4]	

1/ Per capita calculations for fiscal 1970-1973 are based on U.S. Census figures for 1970; fiscal 1974-1975 per capita are based on updated Census figures.

2/ Not available.

3/ Does not include Louisiana.

4/ Does not include American Samoa and Louisiana.

Total Funds Received

The increasing commitment of both state and federal governments to support of state arts agencies, and an increase in private support, have naturally resulted in substantial rises in total funds received. In fiscal 1971, the first year for which data on total funds received are available, state arts agencies received a total of $30,667,292 (not including funds received by associated foundations), but the major part of that was accounted for by New York. Excluding New York, state arts agencies received $10,458,722 in fiscal 1971; total appropriations for the other 54 agencies rose each year, climbing by fiscal 1975 to $40,156,115,* up 249% over fiscal 1971 for an annual growth rate of 40%.

In the one-year period from fiscal 1974 to fiscal 1975 alone, total funds received by state arts agencies rose 47% (excluding New York State), but in the period from fiscal 1975 to fiscal 1976 the rise was lower, with total funds amounting to $83,584,732 (and $47,486,422 if New York State is excluded), a rise of 10% over fiscal 1975, or 18% excluding New York.

---

*The percentage increase does not include amounts received by American Samoa, Guam and Puerto Rico, since this information was not available for fiscal 1971.

Table 220

TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED, FISCAL 1971-1976

	1971 1/ $	1972 $	1973 $	1974 $	1975 $	1976 2/ $	Change 1971-1975 %	Change 1974-1975 %
Alabama	209,147	334,840	354,847	356,085	420,000	651,000	+89	+18
Alaska	200,377	321,600	441,000	500,774	708,100	962,700	+253	+41
American Samoa	3/	3/	3/	120,000	3/	3/	4/	4/
Arizona	107,470	222,800	266,800	305,485	502,500	577,700	+364	+64
Arkansas	79,377	111,320	167,250	481,085	478,321	801,288	+502	-1
California	251,502	274,320	418,492	1,267,747	1,386,685	1,605,000	+451	+9
Colorado	123,306	188,485	206,903	319,975	1,568,832	1,543,386	+1,107	+390
Connecticut	216,911	255,561	349,037	625,917	778,493	1,641,712	+259	+24
Delaware	231,900	140,320	190,404	246,885	276,428	307,650	+18	+12
District of Columbia	96,177	159,520	200,700	202,000	299,600	304,600	+212	+48
Florida	151,779	155,930	194,886	504,945	814,356	825,456	+429	+61
Georgia	203,387	215,444	207,250	443,617	461,825	555,844	+127	+4
Guam	3/	43,350	71,632	78,077	241,392	245,264	4/	+209
Hawaii	394,514	290,985	245,976	777,727	766,737	1,545,894	+94	-1
Idaho	87,877	109,699	160,382	183,508	288,421	356,718	+228	+57
Illinois	710,038	738,604	797,855	877,511	1,416,988	2,200,000	+63	+61
Indiana	132,063	172,322	237,588	500,922	609,355	1,000,000	+361	+22
Iowa	128,437	158,112	170,872	291,787	284,033	500,000	+121	-3
Kansas	199,654	154,141	213,020	261,059	385,799	510,000	+93	+48
Kentucky	226,987	260,980	327,587	428,338	820,555	988,401	+261	+92
Louisiana	129,776	3/	3/	286,150	3/	3/	4/	4/
Maine	243,430	349,985	346,312	385,569	437,000	455,000	+79	+13
Maryland	424,640	540,573	570,492	722,352	802,736	821,083	+89	+11
Massachusetts	242,077	330,022	530,546	785,000	1,840,000	1,251,000	+660	+134
Michigan	452,579	552,736	592,908	941,079	2,624,239	2,738,600	+292	+179
Minnesota	286,244	450,243	554,462	704,585	799,228	995,942	+179	+13
Mississippi	150,377	192,126	219,323	301,298	375,371	2,676,150	+150	+25
Missouri	293,159	473,756	800,348	839,837	1,593,705	1,886,324	+444	+90
Montana	111,377	136,320	183,564	227,092	245,500	310,000	+120	+8

(Continued)

Table 220
TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED, FISCAL 1971-1976
(continued)

	1971[1/] $	1972 $	1973 $	1974 $	1975 $	1976[2/] $	Change 1971-1975	Change 1974-1975
Nebraska	89,050	135,601	205,226	240,274	407,464	594,644	+292	+70
Nevada	87,642	150,000	165,000	188,970	263,036	372,695	+196	+39
New Hampshire	93,085	118,292	173,000	244,412	334,599	464,356	+259	+37
New Jersey	308,536	373,059	408,152	901,482	1,134,716	1,046,064	+268	+26
New Mexico	113,577	202,300	259,800	244,295	455,600	483,800	+301	+86
New York	20,208,570	14,524,320	16,452,250	16,601,000	35,905,500	36,098,310	+76	+116
North Carolina	210,856	295,163	346,112	445,048	591,928	573,411	+181	+33
North Dakota	80,477	103,320	141,250	179,100	234,000	265,200	+191	+31
Ohio	326,328	339,425	516,014	1,084,075	1,273,203	1,395,688	+283	+17
Oklahoma	177,176	311,697	407,467	315,925	401,850	483,837	+127	+27
Oregon	135,501	163,380	206,810	271,713	432,043	612,923	+201	+59
Pennsylvania	299,877	299,877	436,000	1,063,927	2,031,524	2,079,868	+577	+91
Puerto Rico	3/	2,230,020	2,552,801	3,012,167	3,439,567	3,480,197	4/	+14
Rhode Island	350,901	204,492	244,552	418,412	672,082	743,189	+91	+61
South Carolina	222,562	272,232	402,357	713,755	1,705,342	1,929,446	+666	+139
South Dakota	102,283	113,109	137,566	265,032	268,376	331,550	+162	+1
Tennessee	188,765	344,407	530,333	544,752	853,977	683,300	+351	+57
Texas	182,949	306,166	509,463	747,140	734,810	891,454	+302	-2
Utah	170,377	177,220	227,250	271,726	524,800	749,600	+208	+93
Vermont	117,769	150,943	184,122	245,031	345,987	337,675	+192	+41
Virgin Islands	231,404	261,320	327,000	343,167	453,000	540,000	+71	+32
Virginia	233,687	214,735	321,713	412,317	576,855	550,000	+147	+40
Washington	238,267	218,462	265,539	470,164	693,110	1,380,991	+191	+47
West Virginia	250,337	339,909	368,196	542,280	559,617	624,500	+124	+3
Wisconsin	75,377	3/	3/	220,472	301,700	475,000	+221	+37
Wyoming	87,377	122,773	152,332	202,030	240,675	385,260	+75	+19
TOTAL	30,667,292	29,306,316	34,960,741	44,155,072	76,061,615	83,584,732	+136[5/]	+73[6/]
Total Without New York	10,458,722	14,781,996	18,508,491	27,554,072	40,156,115	47,486,422	+249[5/]	+47[6/]

1/ Data for fiscal 1971 from State Arts Councils, Associated Councils of the Arts.
2/ **Figures** for 1976 are estimates.
3/ Not available.
4/ **Comparable** data are lacking.
5/ Does not include American Samoa, Guam and Puerto Rico.
6/ **Does** not include American Samoa and Louisiana.

Total Funds Received per Capita

The pattern of total funds per capita parallels that of the state appropriations, i.e., the areas with the smallest populations tending to rank relatively high, with the largest per capita funds in 1975, $5.03 received by the Virgin Islands Council on the Arts. The states with small populations will naturally tend to rank high in per capita terms even with low appropriations, since the basic state agency grant of The National Endowment for the Arts is distributed at the same level regardless of population. The lowest ranked states were California (6.6 cents), Wisconsin (6.6 cents) and Texas (6.1 cents).

From fiscal 1971 to fiscal 1975, the total funds per capita rose from 15.1 cents to 36.1 cents. Excluding New York State, total funds per capita rose from 5.7 cents to 20.8 cents.

Table 221
TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED PER CAPITA, WITH RANKINGS, FISCAL 1971 - 1975[1/]

	1971		1972		1973		1974		1975	
	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)
Alabama	.061	(32)	.097	(28)	.103	(31)	.100	(44)	.117	(45)
Alaska	.667	(3)	1.071	(2)	1.468	(2)	1.486	(3)	2.101	(3)
American Samoa	2/		2/		2/		4.138	(1)	2/	
Arizona	.061	(32)	.126	(23)	.151	(25)	.142	(30)	.233	(30)
Arkansas	.041	(43)	.058	(40)	.087	(38)	.233	(21)	.232	(31)
California	.013	(52)	.014	(52)	.021	(52)	.061	(54)	.066	(51)
Colorado	.056	(35)	.085	(32)	.094	(36)	.128	(35)	.629	(10)
Connecticut	.072	(24)	.084	(33)	.115	(30)	.203	(25)	.252	(28)
Delaware	.423	(5)	.256	(11)	.347	(9)	.431	(11)	.482	(12)
District of Columbia	.127	(16)	.211	(13)	.265	(12)	.279	(19)	.414	(16)
Florida	.022	(47)	.023	(51)	.029	(51)	.062	(52)	.101	(48)
Georgia	.044	(40)	.047	(45)	.045	(49)	.091	(46)	.095	(50)
Guam	2/		.510	(5)	.843	(5)	.743	(7)	2.299	(2)
Hawaii	.513	(4)	.379	(6)	.320	(11)	.918	(5)	.905	(6)
Idaho	.123	(18)	.154	(21)	.225	(18)	.230	(23)	.361	(21)
Illinois	.064	(30)	.066	(37)	.072	(40)	.079	(50)	.127	(42)
Indiana	.025	(47)	.033	(47)	.046	(47)	.094	(45)	.114	(46)
Iowa	.045	(39)	.056	(43)	.060	(44)	.102	(42)	.099	(49)
Kansas	.089	(21)	.069	(36)	.095	(35)	.115	(40)	.170	(38)
Kentucky	.071	(25)	.081	(34)	.102	(32)	.128	(35)	.244	(29)
Louisiana	.036	(45)	2/		2/		.076	(51)	2/	
Maine	.245	(9)	.353	(8)	.349	(8)	.368	(13)	.417	(15)
Maryland	.108	(20)	.138	(22)	.145	(27)	.176	(27)	.196	(35)
Massachusetts	.043	(41)	.058	(40)	.093	(37)	.135	(31)	.317	(24)
Michigan	.051	(36)	.062	(39)	.067	(43)	.103	(41)	.288	(26)
Minnesota	.075	(23)	.118	(25)	.146	(26)	.180	(26)	.204	(33)
Mississippi	.068	(28)	.087	(31)	.099	(33)	.130	(34)	.162	(39)
Missouri	.063	(31)	.101	(27)	.171	(22)	.176	(27)	.334	(22)
Montana	.160	(12)	.196	(15)	.264	(13)	.309	(15)	.334	(22)
Nebraska	.060	(34)	.091	(29)	.138	(28)	.156	(29)	.264	(27)
Nevada	.179	(10)	.307	(10)	.338	(10)	.330	(14)	.459	(13)
New Hampshire	.126	(17)	.160	(20)	.235	(16)	.302	(17)	.414	(16)

Table 221

TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED PER CAPITA, WITH RANKINGS, FISCAL 1971 - 1975 (continued)

	1971		1972		1973		1974		1975	
	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)	$	(Rank)
New Jersey	.043	(41)	.052	(44)	.057	(45)	.123	(37)	.155	(40)
New Mexico	.112	(19)	.199	(14)	.256	(15)	.218	(24)	.406	(18)
New York	1.108	(2)	.796	(4)	.902	(4)	.917	(6)	1.982	(4)
North Carolina	.041	(43)	.058	(40)	.068	(42)	.083	(49)	.110	(47)
North Dakota	.130	(15)	.167	(18)	.229	(17)	.282	(18)	.367	(20)
Ohio	.031	(46)	.032	(48)	.048	(46)	.101	(43)	.119	(43)
Oklahoma	.069	(27)	.122	(24)	.159	(23)	.117	(34)	.148	(41)
Oregon	.065	(29)	.078	(35)	.099	(33)	.120	(38)	.191	(36)
Pennsylvania	.025	(47)	.025	(50)	.037	(50)	.090	(47)	.172	(37)
Puerto Rico	2/		.822	(3)	.941	(3)	.992	(4)	1.133	(5)
Rhode Island	.371	(6)	.216	(12)	.258	(14)	.447	(10)	.717	(8)
South Carolina	.086	(22)	.105	(26)	.155	(24)	.256	(20)	.613	(11)
South Dakota	.154	(13)	.170	(17)	.207	(21)	.389	(12)	.394	(19)
Tennessee	.048	(38)	.088	(30)	.135	(29)	.132	(33)	.207	(32)
Texas	.016	(51)	.027	(49)	.046	(47)	.062	(52)	.061	(53)
Utah	.161	(11)	.167	(18)	.215	(19)	.232	(22)	.447	(14)
Vermont	.265	(7)	.340	(9)	.414	(7)	.521	(9)	.736	(7)
Virgin Islands	3.704	(1)	4.183	(1)	5.235	(1)	3.813	(2)	5.033	(1)
Virginia	.050	(37)	.046	(46)	.069	(41)	.084	(48)	.118	(44)
Washington	.070	(26)	.064	(38)	.078	(39)	.135	(31)	.199	(34)
West Virginia	.144	(14)	.195	(16)	.211	(20)	.303	(16)	.312	(25)
Wisconsin	.017	(50)	2/		2/		.048	(55)	.066	(51)
Wyoming	.263	(8)	.369	(7)	.458	(6)	.563	(8)	.670	(9)
Total	.151[3]		.148[4]		.177[4]		.206		.361[5]	
Total without New York	.057[3]		.082[4]		.103[4]		.140		.208[5]	

1/ Per capita calculations for 1970-1973 are based on U.S. Census figures for 1970; fiscal 1974-1975 per capita are based on updated Census figures.
2/ Not available.
3/ Does not include American Somoa, Guam and Puerto Rico
_/

1/ Per capita calculations for 1970-1973 are based on U.S. Census figures for 1970; fiscal 1974-1975 per capita are based on updated Census figures.
2/ Not available.
3/ Does not include American Samoa, Guam and Puerto Rico.
4/ Does not include American Samoa, Louisiana and Wisconsin.
5/ Does not include American Samoa and Louisiana.

Adequacy of Funding on Functions and Practices

In the study of agencies' funding levels, directors were asked how adequate current funding levels are for the agencies' functions and practices, and the outlook for the future.

A majority of directors do not feel that the fiscal 1974 funding level was at all adequate, and approximately half that the fiscal 1975 funding was not adequate at all for the functions and practices of their agencies.

The perceptions of the adequacy of funding levels do vary somewhat according to the total expenditures of an agency, and particularly among the higher levels in terms of per capita expenditures. The proportion of agencies that feel the fiscal 1974 funding levels were not adequate at all actually was greater among those agencies with greater total expenditures that year, but sharp differences can be seen within those expenditure groups; those with higher per capita expenditures were less likely to feel funding was completely inadequate:

Table 222
ADEQUACY OF TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL FROM ALL SOURCES
FOR THE AGENCY'S FUNCTIONS AND PRACTICES

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Fiscal 1974		
Completely adequate	-	-
Somewhat adequate	23	42
Not adequate at all	32	58
Fiscal 1975		
Completely adequate	1	2
Somewhat adequate	27	49
Not adequate at all	27	49

Table 223

ADEQUACY OF TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL IN FISCAL 1974 BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

		Expenditures									
			$250,000-$499,999			$500,000-$749,999			$750,000 And Above		
	Total Agencies	Below $250,000	Total	Less Than $.17 Per Capita	$.17 And Above	Total	Less Than $.17 Per Capita	$.17 And Above	Total	Less Than $.17 Per Capita	$.17 And Above
Total	55 100%	15 100%	20 100%	14 100%	6 100%	10 100%	4 100%	6 100%	10 100%	6 100%	4 100%
Somewhat adequate*	23 42%	8 53%	9 45%	5 36%	4 67%	3 30%	1 25%	2 33%	3 30%	1 17%	2 50%
Not adequate at all	32 58%	7 47%	11 55%	9 64%	2 33%	7 70%	3 75%	4 67%	7 70%	5 83%	2 50%

---

* There were no "completely adequate" responses.

A great majority of directors do see trends or shifts in the funding levels during the coming 3 to 5 years, and again when asked in an open-end question what the trends would be, directors tended to be optimistic:

Table 224
WHETHER TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE LEVEL OF FUNDING EXPECTED ARE FORESEEN DURING COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Do foresee trends or shifts	46	84
No trends or shifts	6	11
Not sure	3	5

Table 225
TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN THE LEVEL OF FUNDING EXPECTED FORESEEN DURING COMING 3 TO 5 YEARS*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that do foresee trends or shifts	46	84
Increase in funding (level not specified)	20	36
Increase in state support	20	36
Increase in federal support	6	11
Possible increase in private/business support	3	5
Closer relationships with/increased visibility in state government	1	2
Decrease in funding	2	4
Initial decrease, later increase	2	4
Decrease in private support	2	4
More legislative limitations on funds	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

When directors were asked why they felt the shifts and trends would occur, many diverse reasons were mentioned, topped by increasing interest in and demand for the arts. The reasons that were volunteered by at least two directors are shown on the following table:

Table 226

REASONS WHY TRENDS OR SHIFTS IN LEVEL OF FUNDING ARE FORESEEN*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total agencies that do foresee trends or shifts	46	84
Increased interest in and demand for the arts	15	27
Increased interest and/or activity in legislature	11	20
Support for increase from organization of citizens	7	13
Better communication of needs	5	9
Additional programming and activities	4	7
Proved value of programs supported	4	7
Governor is supportive	3	5
Commission/council efforts	3	5
More arts groups developing	2	4
Increasing costs require more money	2	4
Improvement in economy	2	4
Seriously depressed economy	3	5
Difficulty in convincing government of importance of arts	3	5

---

*Volunteered respones to an open-end question

Future Plans and Goals

In investigating the future plans and goals of the state arts agencies, the survey determined the existence of formal long-term plans, the likely directions of programming if the basic state agency grant were raised, and the desired areas of activity, on a short-term and long-term basis, if sufficient funds were available.

Just under half the agencies have formally drawn up long-term plans and goals, with a median length of time of 4.5 years for which these plans have been set. Most of the other agencies, however, reported that they expected to formulate long-term plans and goals within a year's period after the survey.

Table 227
EXISTENCE OF LONG-TERM PLANS AND GOALS

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Have drawn up formal long-term plans and goals	27	49
*Number of years for which plans have been set:		
2 years	5	9
3 years	6	11
4 years	3	5
5 years	13	24
7 years	1	2
8 years	1	2
More than 10 years	1	2
Median number of years: 4.5		
No long-term plans and goals	28	51
Expect to formulate long-term plans and goals within one year	21	38
Do not expect to formulate long-term plans and goals within one year	7	13

---

*Multiple responses were possible.

With the trend of increasing funds available to state arts agencies, long-term plans and goals would seem essential to chart the effective and efficient use of these funds. The association of formal plans with increased funds is seen in the fact that agencies with higher than average total expenditures were more likely to have such plans:

Table 228
EXISTENCE OF LONG-TERM PLANS AND GOALS, BY TOTAL EXPENDITURES

	Total		Expenditures							
			Below $250,000		$250,000-$499,999		$500,000-$749,999		$750,000 and Over	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total	55	100	15	100	20	100	10	100	10	100
Have drawn up long-term plans and goals	27	49	5	33	10	50	6	60	6	60
No long-term plans and goals	28	51	10	67	10	50	4	40	4	40

Effect of Possible Increases in Basic State Agency Grant

The directors of the state arts agencies were asked what directions their programs would take if the basic state agency grant from the National Endowment for the Arts were increased to the $250,000 level and to the $750,000 level. For both levels they were specifically queried whether they would tend to expand the programming now engaged in or would the increased level of funding enable them to engage in new areas of programming.

At both levels of increased basic state agency grants, a majority of directors would engage in new areas of programming. At the $250,000 level, 18% indicated they would engage in new areas and another 35% that they would both engage in new areas and expand present programming. At the $750,000 level, a higher 38% would engage in new programming and 46% would do both. (No significant differences were recorded by the budget sizes, either in total or per capita.) New areas of programming most often volunteered were support of individual artists, educational programs, community development and support of major institutions.

Table 229
DIRECTIONS OF PROGRAMMING
WITH POSSIBLE INCREASES IN BASIC STATE AGENCY GRANT

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Increase to the $250,000 level		
Would expand programming now engaged in	26	47
Would engage in new areas of programming	10	18
Would do both	19	35
Increase to the $750,000 level		
Would expand programming now engaged in	9	16
Would engage in new areas of programming	21	38
Would do both	25	46

Increases in the basic state agency grant would result in expanded support for individual artists in most agencies, with such support most often volunteered among the new areas of programming. In general, however, the areas cited by directors indicate an extension of what is now being done to include more organizations and to serve more people.

Table 230
NEW AREAS OF PROGRAMMING AGENCY WOULD ENGAGE IN IF BASIC STATE AGENCY GRANT WERE INCREASED TO THE $250,000 LEVEL*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Agencies that would engage in new areas or would both expand present programming and engage in new areas	29	53
Support for individual artist	11	20
Services, funding to major arts organizations and institutions	7	13
Community organizations, local arts councils	4	7
Touring	3	5
Outreach programs	3	5
Financial assistance to arts organizations	3	5
Arts in education	3	5
Technical assistance, consultant services	3	5
Professional programming	2	4
Artists' residencies	2	4
Promotion of the arts	2	4
Research/surveys	2	4
Statewide services	2	4
Information programs	1	2
Special projects	1	2
Leadership program	1	2
Arts for children (non-education)	1	2
Visual arts	1	2
Art in public places	1	2
Film/public media	1	2
Dance touring programs	1	2
Establishment of professional performing arts company	1	2
Not sure	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Table 231
NEW AREAS OF PROGRAMMING AGENCY WOULD ENGAGE IN IF BASIC STATE AGENCY GRANT WERE INCREASED TO THE $750,000 LEVEL

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Agencies that would engage in new areas or would both expand present programming and engage in new areas	46	84
Support for individual artists	36	78
Arts in education	11	20
Basic operating support	10	18
Services, funding to major arts organizations and institutions	9	16
Touring	9	16
Research conferences, workshops, training seminars	7	13
Community organizations and groups, local arts councils	5	9
Diverse programs, non-specific	5	9
Special projects	4	7
Outreach programs	4	7
Statewide programs	4	7
Information programs	3	5
Capital projects	2	4
Administrative guidance to organizations	2	4
Artists' residencies	2	4
Technical assistance	1	2
Architecture/environmental arts	5	11
Visual arts/museums	4	7
Establishment of professional performing arts company	4	7
Folk and ethnic arts	3	5
Film/public media	2	4
Art in public places	1	2
Not sure	2	4

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

As a final phase of the exploration of future directions, directors were given the hypothetical situation of the agency's having sufficient funds to make improvements or changes in programming, staffing or other activities. Given this possibility, they were asked in which two or three areas they would most want to spend those funds, both within the near future and over the next five to ten years.

In both the long-term and short-term outlook, staff development was the most mentioned area in which funds would be spent. This reflects the previously discussed (in Chapter VII) inadequacy of the number of staff and salaries expressed by directors.

Table 232
TWO OR THREE AREAS IN WHICH FUNDS WOULD BE SPENT IN THE NEXT TWO TO THREE YEARS, IF SUFFICIENT FUNDS WERE AVAILABLE FOR IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES IN PROGRAMMING, STAFFING OR OTHER ACTIVITIES*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Increased staff for adequate service to the state	28	51
Increased support/grants to arts and cultural organizations	18	33
Increased emphasis on services throughout the state	16	29
General development of arts in the community	11	20
Support of individual artists	10	18
Increased support of major institutions	7	13
Touring programs	6	11
Support of community arts councils	5	9
Educational programs	5	9
Regional programming, interchange with other states	4	7
Development of new audiences	4	7
Information dissemination	3	5
Technical assistance	3	5
Research	2	4
Ethnic identity programs	2	4
Publications	2	4
Increased professionalism in the arts	2	4
Artists-in-schools	2	4
Distribution of arts to all segments of state population	2	4
Rural programming	2	4
Apprenticeship programs	1	2
Promotion of sales of works of art	1	2
Covering budgets in large institutions	1	2
Special projects	1	2
Restoration of cancelled services	1	2
Capital projects	1	2
Archives, libraries	1	2
Artists' residencies	1	2
Development of county budgeting programs	1	2
Annual state audit of grantees	1	2
Combined management efforts	1	2
Combined fund-raising efforts	1	2
Planning, non-specific	1	2
Greater involvement with labor	1	2
Inner city programming	1	2
Improvement in agency's facilities	1	2
Evaluation capabilities	1	2
Cultural preservation	1	2
Public media	3	5
Visual arts	1	2
Crafts	1	2
Environmental arts, architecture	1	2
Archives, libraries	1	2
Development of performing arts organizations	1	2
Literature	1	2
Humanities programs	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 233

TWO OR THREE AREAS IN WHICH FUNDS WOULD BE SPENT
IN THE NEXT FIVE TO TEN YEARS,
IF SUFFICIENT FUNDS WERE AVAILABLE FOR IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES
IN PROGRAMMING, STAFFING OR OTHER ACTIVITIES*

	Total Agencies	
	#	%
Total	55	100
Increased staff for adequate service to the state	20	36
Increased support/grants to arts and cultural organizations	18	33
Increased emphasis on services throughout the state	13	24
Support of individual artists	13	24
Educational programs	11	20
General development of arts in the community	10	18
Touring programs	9	16
Increased support of major institutions	7	13
Support of community arts councils	6	11
Distribution of arts to all segments of state population	5	9
Development of new audiences	3	5
Capital projects	3	5
Artists-in-schools	3	5
Increased professionalism in the arts	3	5
Apprenticeship programs	2	4
Regional programming	2	4
Amateur, semi-professional programming	2	4
Greater involvement with labor	2	4
Rural programming	2	4
Evaluation capabilities	2	4
Promotion of sales of works of art	1	2
Partnership programs with government and private funding	1	2
Encouragement of public support of the arts	1	2
Programs in trouble areas	1	2
Regional art centers	1	2
Publications	1	2
Libraries	1	2
Communications with state legislature	1	2
Development of county budgeting programs	1	2
Annual state audit of grantees	1	2
Combined management efforts	1	2
Combined fund-raising efforts	1	2
Inner city programming	1	2
Artists' residencies	1	2
Cultural preservation	1	2
Architecture and environmental arts	5	9
Art in public places	3	5
Performing arts programs	2	4
Literature	2	4
Folk and ethnic arts	2	4
Development of performing arts organizations	2	4
Visual arts	1	2
Crafts	1	2
Plastic arts	1	2
Public media	1	2
Humanities programs	1	2
Museums	1	2

---

*Volunteered responses to an open-end question.

Observation:

The emphasis on staff seems to indicate an interest by the agencies to supply more in the way of service than simply project funding, the desire to fulfill a role as ombudsman, counselor, technical advisor, back-up on management, promoter, communicator, etc., in behalf of the arts and cultural interests in the states.

Funding remains a primary purpose, however, with high priority given to increased funds to the arts and cultural organizations. The emphasis on arts in the community is also strong, continuing the direction toward community programming expressed earlier. Further, the emphasis is on functions and problems, rather than on specific art forms. By and large, however, the responses do not indicate any major deviations at higher funding levels from present program patterns.

APPENDIX A

MODEL STATE ARTS COUNCIL ACT

Model State Arts Council Act*

(Title should conform to state requirements. The following is a suggestion.)

AN ACT

Relating to the establishment of a State Council on the Arts, and defining the Council's powers and duties.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF (state), AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. *(optional introductory declaration of public policy)* It is hereby found that many of our citizens lack the opportunity to view, enjoy, or participate in living theatrical performances, musical concerts, operas, dance and ballet recitals, art exhibits, examples of fine architecture, and the performing and fine arts generally. It is hereby further found that, with increasing leisure time, the practice and enjoyment of the arts are of increasing importance and that the general welfare of the people of the state will be promoted by giving further recognition to the arts as a vital aspect of our culture and heritage and as a valued means of expanding the scope of our educational programs.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the state to join with private patrons and with institutions and professional organizations concerned with the arts to insure that the role of the arts in the life of our communities will continue to grow and will play an ever more significant part in the welfare and educational experience of our citizens.

Section 2. There is hereby created and established a state commission, to be known as the "(state) State Council on the Arts," to consist of fifteen members, broadly representative of all fields of the performing and fine arts, to be appointed by the governor from among citizens of (state) who are widely known for their competence and experience in connection with the performing and fine arts. In making such appointments, due consideration shall be given to the recommendations made by representative civic, educational, and professional associations and groups, concerned with or engaged in the production or presentation of the performing and fine arts generally.

Section 3. The term of office of each member shall be five years; provided, however, that of the members first appointed, five shall be appointed for terms of one year, five for terms of three years, and five for terms of five years. Other than the chairman, no member of the council who serves a full five-year term shall be eligible for reappointment during a one-year period following the expiration of his term. The governor shall designate a chairman and a vice-chairman from the members of the council to serve as such at the pleasure of the governor. The chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the council. All vacancies shall be filled for the balance of the unexpired term in the same manner as original appointments. The members of the council shall not receive any compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties as members of the council.

---

*Reprinted from The Politics of Art: Forming a State Arts Council, published by Associated Councils of the Arts.

Section 4. The chairman may employ, and at pleasure remove, such officers, experts, and other employees as may be needed and fix their compensation within the amounts made available for such purposes.

Section 5. The duties of the council shall be:

(1) To stimulate and encourage throughout the state the study and presentation of the performing and fine arts and public interest and participation therein;

(2) To make such surveys as may be deemed advisable of public and private institutions engaged within the state in artistic and cultural activities, including but not limited to, music, theatre, dance, painting, sculpture, architecture, and allied arts and crafts, and to make recommendations concerning appropriate methods to encourage participation in and appreciation of the arts to meet the legitimate needs and aspirations of persons in all parts of the state;

(3) To take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to encourage public interest in the cultural heritage of our state and to expand the state's cultural resources; and

(4) To encourage and assist freedom of artistic expression essential for the well-being of the arts.

Section 6. The council is hereby authorized and empowered to hold public and private hearings, to enter into contracts, within the limit of funds available therefor, with individuals, organizations, and institutions for services furthering the educational objectives of the council's programs; to enter into contracts, within the limit of funds available therefor, with local and regional associations for cooperative endeavors furthering the educational objectives of the council's programs; to accept gifts, contributions, and bequests of unrestricted funds from individuals, foundations, corporations, and other organizations or institutions for the purpose of furthering the educational objectives of the council's programs; to make and sign any agreements and to do and perform any acts that may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The council may request and shall receive from any department, division, board, bureau, commission, or agency of the state such assistance and data as will enable it properly to carry out its powers and duties hereunder.

Section 7. The council is the official agency of this state to receive and disburse any funds made available by the National Foundation on the Arts.

Section 8. The council shall make an interim report to the governor and the legislature not later than (date), and from time to time thereafter.

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

GENERAL TERMS:

Fiscal 1974 -- The fiscal year ending in 1974.

Earmarked or restricted funds -- Funds received by a state arts agency for which the recipient has been designated and over which the state arts agency has no discretionary granting power.

Program and project -- A program refers to a broad area of funding or activity such as an agency's touring program, technical assistance program, music program, artists-in-schools program, etc. A project refers to a specific individual project usually within a program area, such as a specific dance company's tour in the state, the assignment of an advisor to provide technical assistance to a particular arts organization, the support of concerts by a particular symphony orchestra, the assignment of an artist to a school, etc.

Grants -- The word "grants" is used to cover the funding of recipients by the state arts agency, whether such funding is done as a grant or through a contract.

Agency -- An agency refers to a government agency, usually a state agency; if a federal or local agency is referred to, it will be indicated.

Cultural organization or institution -- A "cultural organization or institution" or "arts or cultural organization or institution" covers all types of organizations, institutions or groups, such as performing arts organizations, museums and other similar institutions, visual arts groups, writers' projects, cultural centers, non-governmental arts councils, etc.

Commissions to artists -- Funds provided an artist for the creation of a new work (painting, drawing, musical composition, dance, play, novel, etc.)

Purchase grant -- Funds provided an artist for the purchase of a work already created.

Work grants -- Funds provided an artist for general support and not for the purchase or commissioning of a work.

SELF-ADMINISTERED FORM B:

Art museum -- A museum whose collection/exhibitions are exclusively or predominantly art, including paintings, drawings, sculpture, graphics, etc.

History museum -- A museum whose collections/exhibitions are exclusively or predominantly history, including historic houses and sites and museum villages.

Science museum -- A museum whose collections/exhibitions are exclusively or predominantly science, including natural history museums, science and technology centers, zoos, aquariums, botanical gardens, etc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General museum -- A museum whose collections/exhibitions are a relatively equal combination of art and history, art and science, history and science, or art, history and science.

Cultural center -- A structure or complex of structures designed for the public presentation of more than one art form.

Civic group -- A group of citizens primarily organized for non-arts purposes (e.g., the PTA, Chamber of Commerce, etc.) but conducting some arts-related activity such as sponsorship of performances, etc.

Orchestral/chamber, etc. -- Including all types of orchestral and chamber music, solo recitals, etc.

Theatre -- Including all types of theatrical presentations, such as musicals, drama, children's theatre, revues, dramatic readings, etc.

Literature -- The publication or presentation of non-dramatic literary material such as poetry or fiction, but does not include non-literary publications such as newsletters or pamphlets.

Earned Income -- Operating revenues received from admission fees and box office and subscription ticket sales, tuition fees, contract fees, membership dues, sales of merchandise, parking fees, monies from concessions, etc.

SELF-ADMINISTERED FORM C:

Full-time -- a paid staff member (or "consultant" serving in a staff capacity) who works a minimum of 35 hours a week on a regular basis.

Part-time -- a paid staff member (or "consultant" serving in a staff capacity) who works fewer than 35 hours per week on a regular basis or who works any number of hours for only a part of the year.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW:

Subordinate agency of a larger agency -- The situation in which the state arts agency is a full agency but is under the direction of another state agency.

An office in an agency that has purposes other than the arts -- The situation in which the state arts agency is not actually a full agency, but is only an office within a state agency that has purposes other than the arts.